DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 597 EA 001 922

By-Lynch, Patrick D., Ed.; Blackstone, Peggy L., Ed.

Institutional Roles for In-Service Education of School Administrators.

New Mexico Univ., Albuquerque. Dept. of Educational Administration and Foundations.; University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.

Pub Date 66

Note-146p.; Papers presented at UCEA Task Force Seminar on Continuing Educ. of School Administrators (Albuquerque, N. Mex., April 27-30, 1966).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.40

Descriptors-*Administrative Personnel, Educational Change, *Inservice Education, Interinstitutional Cooperation, Internship Programs, Management Education, Medical Schools, Models, Professional Associations, *Professional Continuing Education, Psychological Needs, Reinforcement, *School Administration, School Districts, *Universities

This document is a compilation of papers read at a 4-day conference attended by 60 participants from throughout the United States. Chapters include (1) "In-Service Education of School Administrators: Background, Present Status, and Problems," by Robert B. Howsam; (2) "Notes on Institutional Relationships in the In-Service Education of the Professional Administrator," by Keith Goldhammer; (3) "Inter-Institutional Model for In-Service Training and Changes in School Systems," by Patrick D. Lynch; (4) "Continuing Medical Education," by Reginald Fitz; (5) "The Development and Implementation of a Residence Executive Development Training Program," by Simon Herman; (6) "Models for Change in School Systems: Reinforcement," by Robert J. Berger; (7) "In-Service Training of Industrial Management," by Robert Utter; and (8) "Psychological Processes in Influencing Change," by Stanley W. Caplan. (JK)

ED 027 597

Continuing Education of School Administrators

EA 001 922

UCEA TASK-FORCE SEMINAR

INSTITUTIONAL ROLES FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Edited by

Dr. Patrick D. Lynch

Mrs. Peggy L. Blackstone

Published by

University of New Mexico

Department of Educational Administration and Foundations

in cooperation with

The University Council for Educational Administration

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Copyright, 1966, by

University of New Mexico Department of Educational Administration

and Foundations, College of Education

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission from the publisher.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Richard L. Holemon

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copies of this booklet are available from the University Council for Educational Administration, 65 South Oval Drive, Columbus, Ohio, 43210, and from the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations, College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Copies no longer available

CONTRIBUTORS

Robert Howsam

Chairman, Department of Educational Administration

University of Rochester

Rochester, New York

Keith Goldhammer

Associate Dean, School of Education

University of Oregon

Eugene, Oregon

Patrick Lynch

Associate Professor, Director of NIMH Administrator Training Program

College of Education

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

Reginald Fitz

Dean, School of Medicine

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

Simon Herman

Psychologist, Lecturer, School of Business Administration

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

Robert Berger

Assistant Professor, College of Education

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

CONTRIBUTORS

Robert Utter
Psychologist
Sandia Corporation
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Stanley Caplan
Psychologist
Litton Systems, Inc.
College Park, Maryland

George Young
Superintendent of Schools
Gallup, New Mexico

Samuel Popper
Associate Professor, College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Jack Culbertson
Executive Director
University Council for Educational Administration
Columbus, Ohio

Chester Travelstead
Dean, College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In planning for this Task Force Seminar on Continuing Education of School Administrators, thanks to Jack Culbertson and his staff in order first of all. His advice on the program and its organization helped us bring the problem into focus. Sam Popper spent many hours with us at Minneapolis, at Chicago, and at Atlantic City pulling ideas into position.

At the University of New Mexico, The Educational and Administrative Service department members worked hard to pull the program together, translating Culbertson's, Popper's, and each other's ideas into flesh and blood assignments. Paul Petty, Department Chairman and UCEA Plenary Representative for three years has encouraged this department to plan a task force seminar on the topic, and has given leadership toward this end. James Cooper and Horacio Ulibarri also of the University of New Mexico did much of the preparatory work.

President Tom Popejoy enthusiastically approved the expenditure of University resources which allowed flexibility in planning and made the work of the participants more pleasant. Finally, the NIMH Administrator Training Fellows gave of their time and comments as recorders and participants.

THE EDITORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contributors 3

Acknowledgments 5

* Chapter I In-Service Education of School Administrators: Background, Present Status, and Problems, Robert B. Howsam 8

Chapter II Notes on Institutional Relationships in the In-Service Education of the Professional Administrator, Keith Goldhammer 31

Chapter III Inter-Institutional Model for In-Service Training and Changes in School Systems, Patrick D. Lynch ... 46

Chapter IV Continuing Medical Education, Reginald Fitz 62

Chapter V The Development and Implementation of a Residence Executive Development Training Program, Simon Herman 69

Chapter VI Models for Change in School Systems: Reinforcement, Robert J. Berger 80

Chapter VII In-Service Training of Industrial Management, Robert Utter 94

Chapter VIII Psychological Processes in Influencing Change, Stanley W. Caplan 102

Chapter IX An Administrator's Reactions to Presentations, George Young 108

Chapter X Response and Implications, Samuel H. Popper 116

Chapter XI Dr. Culbertson's Closing Remarks 137

Chapter XII Dean Travelstead's Closing Remarks 142

Appendix Task Force Participants 144

* The papers in this book were presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Task Force Seminar which had as its theme "Continuing Education of School Administrators." The seminar was conducted at the Western Skies Motor Hotel, Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 27 - 30, 1966.

CHAPTER I

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS: BACKGROUND, PRESENT STATUS, AND PROBLEMS

Robert B. Howsam

Let me begin this paper by attempting to disabuse you of any possible misconceptions about what it purports to be. From the title -- assigned in this case, in the same way as are many such titles, because programs demand titles long before the specific content has been determined -- you might conclude that the content will include a scholarly review of the history and development of administrator in-service education, a comprehensive review of present activities, and a penetrating analysis of the problems standing in the way of achieving well-defined in-service program goals. None of these expectations is either intended or deserved. If for no better reason, time alone did not permit such an approach. My intention is to open up the topic, report the responses to a letter of inquiry directed to U.C.E.A. institutions, describe and discuss some of our own attempts at in-service education for administrators, and present some problems and issues arising out of experience, dialogue, and reading.

THE NEED FOR ADMINISTRATOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

There seems little reason to dwell on the need for in-service education for educational administrators. Such a need arises universally in complex societies, since those who have to deal with the complexities of the society are never adequately prepared for their responsibilities. The need for in-service training is recognized even when the technology and social institutions are relatively stable. In times of rapid change, the need for continuous learning and relearning increases dramatically. The beginning inadequacies of people are compounded many times over as the years pass. Further, in times of rapid change the advantage of experience tends to be lost; the newcomer to an organization is a serious threat to the well established since their recent training is more up-to-date.

In our present society, the need to grow and develop is obvious to any who is perceptive. For those who lack such perceptivity, there is little chance of peace of mind for we are constantly bombarded with the evidence of such need from people who make a business of studying social and technological change, manpower needs and training challenges. We have transferred the term "retooling" from the shop and the assembly line into the general social lexicon and use it to indicate the universal need for continuous learning just to remain adequate for the routines of work and life. We talk of the need for retooling technical personnel from 3 to 5 times during their lifetimes. Our own literature, like that of administration in other areas, is replete with warnings of the danger of obsolescence.

Writing in the Harvard Business Review, William R. Dill and others say:

> " . . . as the pace of change in the business environment and the development of new managerial methods and knowledge accelerate, even an alert and informed executive must wonder occasionally whether he will be nimble enough to survive. Beyond the changes in the world of business which affect his role as a manager, changes in society may outdate his competences and attitudes as a citizen.
>
> The threat of personal obsolescence is a challenge at all levels. The senior manager with 10 to 15 years to serve can no longer count on exploiting his present knowledge and skills comfortably until he retires."[3]

In similar vein, Welmar F. Bernthal last year, in speaking to educators, said:

> "Will the existing breed of administrators in our organizations rise to the challenge? Can we assume that the new research opportunities coming out of modern research methodology will excite them into venturing into the unknown? Or more negatively, will the haunting fear that they may be losing the race between obsolescence and retirement force them into searching out new insights and methods in administration, as a measure of self-preservation." [1]

None of us here will fail to recognize our own educational situation in these remarks. Probably we would say it applies to us as completely as it does in business and industry. Many might say that our problem is even more serious in that education is being catapulted from the 19th into the 20th century during the decade of the sixties. In addition, we are experiencing both social and technological revolution simultaneously.

Without objective evidence upon which to base it, I would venture to make the statement that there has been a significant increase in both interest in and demand for in-service learning opportunities on the part of practicing school administrators in recent years. I would also anticipate an acceleration of this trend in the years ahead. This interest in in-service opportunities probably arises from two major factors which are fairly obvious:

1. The increasing complexities of the job causes problems and anxieties which lead the administrator to seek to update his competence.
2. Educational and technological advances present clear signals of need for new knowledge and skills.

Not so obvious, perhaps, is a third factor which may be the most basic reason of all:

3. Educational preparation programs have changed so fundamentally in many

> institutions that the practitioners feel themselves out of touch with developments in the profession. They want to be brought back into the fold. Since many cannot reasonably expect to undergo further extensive formal preparation, they seek the only available alternative -- in-service education.

As Ben Willis has pointed out, " . . . most of the major administrative posts in American education for the next 10 or 15 years at least will be held by persons who have completed their formal programs of education and who must learn in a variety of ways to cope with the problems they now face."[7] These administrators will be inducting new talent to the administrative ranks. The younger administrators are known to have been prepared differently and are thought to view things differently and speak a different language. So rapid is the pace of development in instructional approaches and materials in the preparing colleges that even those who completed programs only a few years back feel this situation keenly. Intelligent self-interest, if nothing more, dictates an attempt to share in the newer approaches. As long as we in the Universities succeed in projecting the image of dynamic development in our field we will be faced with the consequences of generating anxieties in the field and stimulating demands for in-service opportunities. Many will agree with Willis that " . . . although improving the pre-service preparation of future school administrators is vital, the in-service, or continuing, education of those men and women now holding responsible administrative positions is of even greater significance at this moment."

Some will agree with Willis but perhaps for a different reason. There is no room here for a discussion of the sociology of role induction into a profession. Nevertheless, understanding it seems critical in our attempt to comprehend the respective roles and importance of in-service and pre-service education. What the trainee accepts and what he rejects in his formal preparation experiences seems to be strongly influenced by what he perceives to be acceptable and real in the field.[2] He appears to take more of his cues from the practitioner than he does from the professor. If we wish to be maximally effective, we have no choice but to attempt to bridge the gap -- more recently, perhaps, a chasm or gulf -- between the practitioner and the professor, the field and the campus. In-service education is the major means to this end. We risk the whole impact of our in-service preparation programs if we fail to help the people in the field to understand the new graduates and prepare a hospitable environment for their services and continuing development.

In addition, if we wish to generate the habit of life-long learning expectations, the trainee needs to see it in action while he is a trainee. (Though not relevant at this point, I cannot resist pointing out that from this point of view we would have to be seen as too long persisting in maintaining a dichotomy between in-service and pre-service education; they should be viewed as continuous).

One could go on at length on some of these notions. In the interests of conserving time for other purposes, allow me to assume acceptance of the need for in-service education opportunities on our part at least. Clearly we would not be present if we were not inclined to such acceptance.

PRESENT IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

It is well known to all of us that a great deal of in-service education work with school administrators is being done by colleges and universities across the country. The nature and extent of what is being done is not so well known to us, however.

For its 1963 publication, the A.A.S.A. Commission on In-Service Education for School Administration did a "rather extensive survey" to see what was being done. Its findings were not reported comprehensively, however. Instead the Commission chose to devote one chapter (Chapter six) to illustrative programs. In concluding this section of its report, the Commission stated: "Clearly, there is a tremendous range and variety of programs under way. Nearly everything that can be thought of or imagined that has implications for improving school administration and for making the schools better is being tried somewhere in some degree and in some fashion." [6] In the A.A.S.A. publication, some of the more elaborate programs are reported in sufficient detail as to be quite useful.

It was felt that some knowledge of the activities of U.C.E.A. institutions would be useful for this seminar. Thus, on rather short notice, a letter was sent out calling for assistance. The request was open ended with the deliberate intent of allowing the respondents the opportunity to interpret what in their institution was being done that could be viewed as in-service in nature.

Thirty-five U.C.E.A. institutions responded to the letter. Some letters were brief; others were two or more pages in length. Some reported only on activities. Others interjected discussion of problems or issues. Some included brochures and other materials which helped to describe activities. All were helpful in getting a picture -- though certainly not a complete one -- of what U.C.E.A. institutions are doing.

The letter requested a response covering four areas:

1. Activities during 1965-66 "which have as a clearly recognized purpose the in-service education of the administrator.
2. The nature and extent of the commitment to in-service education of administrators.

3. Any particular problems experienced.

4. Any developmental ideas, plans, or commitments.

Most of the space in the response letters was devoted to reporting in-service education activities for the year. No attempt will be made to report on these in detail. On the other hand, an attempt will be made to present a generalized picture.

It is clear that by far the strongest emphasis is on conferences, work shops, seminars, and other similar activities bearing a variety of names. Almost all of the institutions reported activities in this area. Some had a number of such programs. Duration was from one to three days with a few running longer. Some of these programs have a depth and continuity that is apparent. Others seem to be sporadic and general. Examples of the former type might be Harvard's Advanced Administrative Institute which lasts 10 days and brings people on invitation from all over the United States. Another would be the Superintendent's Work Conference run annually by Teachers College, Columbia, for three weeks and with forty superintendents. Most conferences use a combination of local and imported speakers and consultants. Most address themselves to some current topic. Some are jointly sponsored by a university and other agencies such as professional associations or state departments of education. Some carry academic credit; some do not.

Closely related to the conference and workshop in intent is the series of seminars or meetings spaced intermittently through the year and conducted mainly for one day or less at a time. Eight institutions reported being associated in activities of this kind.

Several institutions emphasized that their on-campus and extension teaching activities were seen as in-service in nature. These institutions tend to see their sixth-year programs, and perhaps also the doctorate, as being designed for practicing school administrators. People without administrative experience and some preparation are not accepted to these programs. Thus, the regular teaching function of the department of educational administration becomes one of working with the field administrators in credit courses. This emphasis was clearly stated by three institutions. Its presence could be inferred from several other letters. (The existence of this emphasis and relatively simple certification requirements would have to go hand in hand. New York's new requirements set 60 hours of graduate work as a minimum for almost any kind of administrative work. The consequence is that pre-service work is emphasized.)

Closely related to this way of identifying in-service and pre-service work is the Michigan State concept of the extern. Here the campus follows the new administrator onto his job for a year and by means of consultation and group seminars aids the person through his first year or two of administration.

Only six institutions reported working with individual districts in the development and conduct of in-service education programs for the administrative staffs of those districts. Usually this was reported as consisting of one or two faculty members' working with a limited number of local districts (In no case more than 4).

Nine of the universities reported that they sponsor a school development association or school study council and conduct in-service education activities largely through this medium. The council in such cases tends to be the agency which identifies needs and operates programs. It may be that the incidence of support for development councils is higher than the 25% figure suggests.

Six of the letters indicated that faculty members serve as consultants to school systems. Five others indicated school surveys as in-service education activities. Mention of these in response to our open questions indicates that these institutions view such activities as having at least important components of in-service education. Indeed, one respondent said, "We continue to do school surveys which I indignantly assert have in-service values for administrators." It is highly probable that such activities are conducted on all campuses. Failure to mention them may be interpreted to mean that they are not viewed as largely in-service in nature.

Almost all of the reported activities have been included under the categories indicated above. A few isolated examples of activities not readily so categorized were reported but are not seen as being different enough to report on separately.

Perhaps mention should be made of the three or four cases where institutions are either mingling administrators from different fields (public administration, school administration) or emphasizing the significance of the disciplines such as political science or economics. This emphasis is more rare than might be expected, however.

No attempt has been made to do justice to the details of reported activities. Presumably most of the reporting universities are represented here and will provide detail where such is considered relevant to our deliberations.

Leaving out detail, however, it does seem clear that the bulk of our activities in in-service education come under the general category of conferences or seminars devoted to specific topics of current interest and extending over a relatively brief period of time. With notable exceptions, the clientele is self-selected. Probably most groups include a considerable variety of people from a range of different positions. On the other hand, our greatest impact in at least some institutions may be through influence on administrators in service who return to the campus for more advanced work either within or without the framework of a degree program.

I am led to venture the expression of the feeling that the overall picture, with relatively few exceptions, is one of sporadic activities conducted in rather traditional patterns. Perhaps they are modeled after the old 'teachers' conventions.

Some of the letters left little doubt as to the strength of the commitment to in-service education for administrators. More indicated a recognition of need but inadequate resources to meet the need. A few seem to view the area as in need of attention but to question whether it was an appropriate function for a university or, perhaps, for their university.

There was little evidence of any great ferment in the area of in-service education. Few responded to the request for information about any new developments in prospect. Keith Goldhammer will, I presume, be telling us about their experimentation in Pendleton. Experimentation may be implied in the reports of some other institutions but it certainly is not emphasized. One gets the impression that we are, by and large, sitting on our collective hands at a time when we can ill afford to be warming our hands by this method.

A SELF-REPORTED CASE OF EXPERIMENTATION

It is the fish which can be induced to open his mouth that is most vulnerable to being caught. This specimen, not yet landed and mounted, had his mouth open at the wrong time and was landed for this assignment (Instead of mounting such catches the planners tend to release the catch in case he might provide sport for another day). In any case, some of us at Rochester spend a great deal of time confronting the issue of what needs to be done in in-service education for administrators and in attempting to develop effective means of accomplishing it. We cannot dignify our efforts as research; perhaps they are better described as developmental. In any case, they do, on a continuing basis, occupy a considerable portion of our professional time and attention. And we do think that we are learning from them.

Our experience may be described in terms of the past five or six years. Six years ago we had a thriving school study council with a member of our department acting as executive secretary. Its efforts, like those of so many study councils, were addressed to the general professional population. Thus, its benefits for the school administrator tended to be of the kind that he could glean from participation with teachers in programs of curricular interest.

In addition, each summer we ran a three-day workshop or conference which was expressly designed for school administrators. The theme might be "merit pay" or "Stresses in School Administration." Some of the chief school officers of the areas attended. Others sent an assistant or a principal. The programs were generally well received by those who attended but they felt no great compulsion to return the following year.

In 1961, we began the cooperative relationship with Buffalo, Cornell, and Syracuse which thrust us into a developmental administrative internship program and permitted us the ongoing luxury of dialogue with professors from other institutions. The internship soon had us thinking seriously about the broader questions of what is effective in the preparation of anyone for administration. It also provided us with the means of developing ever closer relations with a limited number of local school districts. One of these districts soon began to explore in-service work with us and our thrust in this direction took form.

This (Webster) district was interested in a program of in-service education for its administrative and supervisory staff. It consulted with us about what such a program should or might include. The package which we arrived at was:

1. A series of monthly seminars.
2. An annual week-end retreat.
3. Sending two administrators a year to the National Training Laboratories

program at Bethel, Maine. This on a rotational basis.

4. Sending two administrators a year to a simulated materials workshop on a rotational basis.

In addition, the usual activities of attending professional meetings and conferences was to continue. From the beginning it was emphasized that a long-term view was being taken and that the program was to extend over at least five years in time.

We were delighted when, after submission by the Chief School officer the Board of Education approved the package without change. The Board had thus agreed to pay all charges in connection with the program. All of the administrative staff from the chief school officer through the vice principals were to be included. This represented a group of just under twenty.

Neither the simulated materials workshop nor the National Training Laboratories experience needs further elaboration since all are familiar with the Whitman School simulation program and all will know about interpersonal relations training or T-Group training. Perhaps I should add, however, that the group has pressed for speeding up the rotation system with the result that more people are being sent each year. Two went to Bethel the first year; three went the next; I understand that four are to go this year. Already some are suggesting a return experience.

The seminar series was based on the idea that there is a "new look" in administrator preparation and that those in service who were prepared earlier have need for ample opportunity to learn the new approaches. Thus, from the beginning, it was ruled that the sessions were to be devoted to the presentation and discussion of newer materials. They were not to be for bull sessions nor were they to be used for working on district problems. Largely they were to emphasize research and the conceptual. The plan was to meet for two hours of presentation and interrogation, have dinner, and then return for two hours of discussion of the implications of the materials for practicing administrators. On each occasion at first there was an outside speaker or consultant. Topics were determined and speakers chosen by a three-person planning committee which met with a representative of the University.

During the first year there was a tendency to focus on a variety of topics drawn largely from the field of organization and organizational behavior. The availability of speakers influenced the program; speakers included such recognized figures as Ralph Tyler, Andrew Halpin, and Bertram Gross as well as local and area professors. Working this way seemed to lead to interesting sessions but to problems in continuity and in making applications. So the decision was made to try a central theme for the second year and to seek much more continuity by having one person make a series of presentations. The area of choice was personnel administration with emphasis on behavioral sciences and research materials.

Before the end of the second year, we of the university began to be concerned that the Webster program was too much "our baby." Thus, we sought ways of being involved and committed without having the group dependent on us. A break came in the spring of the second year when a training specialist from the local Xerox Corporation was identified by the planning committee and brought in without University help. This approach was encouraged. Since that time, the University representative has continued to meet with the planning committee but has progressively relinquished responsibility for ensuring the success of each program. We are much happier with the changed relationship. At present we tend to make presentations only when we have something that we think particularly relevant and the planning committee sees fit to schedule it.

The Xerox trainer did even more for us. He introduced the group to in-house sensitivity training. For at least a year we at the University had wanted to do this but never found either the confidence or the courage to try it. This got us started. Since that time the group has become acutely conscious of its own processes and has devoted considerable time to organizational problems such as communication, relationships, and role conflicts. We serve in the trainer role for this process. Whenever the group so decides it plugs substantive materials in, often on short notice.

Retreats have become the favored in-service mechanism. For Webster they were a success from the start. The first one, however, contained considerable of the traditional substantive material. The Xerox official joined two University consultants at the second retreat. It was at this time that the relationships emphasis really got under way. The program was less structured. Spontaneously generated confrontations were so dynamic that the golf afternoon was entirely consumed; not an administrator left that long session. Similarly the hour for summation was cut to five minutes by an unexpected but crucial confrontation.

Now two retreats a year are held. Next week will see us at a motel about 40 miles away from home from Thursday through Saturday. The program will be almost completely unstructured and the group will be responsible for it. It can safely be predicted that attention will be given to further removal of barriers to effective relationships and communication.

This is where we think we are in Webster. We haven't arrived. But we do think that we have gained insights and developed better means and objectives. And we also are convinced that year by year the Webster administrative organization and climate are becoming more favorable. It appears that we do have 20 administrators who have been working hard on their own development over the past three years and who accept a continuing commitment to self-improvement.

A footnote or two might be in order:

1. The Board of Education in Webster has just recently committed itself to experimenting with a similar program for itself. It expects to employ both seminars

and retreats as well as observation and analysis of its processes.

2. So much interest has been generated that next year the director of elementary education, the high school principal, and the high school vice-principal all are taking leave to pursue advanced studies. A very promising high school teacher will join them also in preparation for administration.

Another type of footnote also is in order:

1. Other districts have learned of the Webster program and have sought help. We are completing 2 1/2 years with a second district and 2 years with a third. Similar experiences could be reported for them.

2. Modifications of the plan have been attempted. In two successive years we have tried a series of seminars for kinship groups. Administrators and supervisors have come together once a month over a five- to ten-month period for seminar experiences similar to the earlier Webster ones. One included personnel from several suburban districts. The other was for administrators from ten rural districts. We did not continue the first but the latter is in the planning stages for another year. We are interested in knowing whether we can move a kinship group from a purely cognative approach to concern with the relationships realm and make any difference in the members' behavior. Things were far enough along this year that we are willing to continue our efforts.

With two of our districts we originally included department heads in the in-house groups. In both cases, the experience was unfavorable. The department head appears to be outside the skin of the administrative system and to create special problems for the group when included. Presently in one district we have a seminar series just for department heads.

We have continued to offer our two-week summer simulated material workshop for experienced administrators, and we continue strong support for the development council. Other than this we are doing only what has been described above. For the present at least our major thrust is in the direction of concentrating on developing ongoing relationships in depth with the administrative staffs of a few school districts and on experimenting with different in-service processes.

I shall not attempt to give any great rationale for our program. We have been proceeding empirically. One kind of generalization becomes clearer, however.

There are some in-service needs of administrators which are relatively superficial. They involve extension or modification of behavior already learned and accepted. Then there are other needs which are much more fundamental and difficult. These involve changes that will be accomplished only by upsetting experiences. An example of the former would be learning to use the computer for scheduling or home reporting or learning to PERT planning activities. An example of the latter is learning to involve people when one has always been autocratic or learning to communicate feelings when one has never done so.

Similarly, there are some in-service training activities that are suited for some kinds of learning experiences but quite unsuited for others. Which are which? Buried somewhere in this question is the issue of the significance of the ongoing face-to-face group. It seems that the upsetting kinds of experiences needed for the support of fundamental behavioral changes can be tolerated by most people only when a close and supportive group or interpersonal relationship is present. This suggests the conclusion that seminars and kinship groups may be suitable for addressing the simpler problems of change but may be quite unsuited for the deeper and more fundamental tasks of change.

Inspection of the results reported in the A.A.S.A. report and the content of the letters collected as data for this report leads me to speculate that we are sending boys to do the jobs of men. Only a few of the described programs have anything like the power that would be needed for any basic impact on the participants. Thus, I am led to conclude that we need:

1. To stick to relatively routine and technical issues and problems for our conferences, workshops, and seminars.
2. To develop strategies and programs for confronting the deeper problems on the solution of which rests much of our future.

It is with testing these ideas that we have been working.

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

Many of the problems and issues will already be clear. Let me end by highlighting a few of them, however.

Definition. The letter to U.C.E.A. institutions asked that representatives report "all types of activities which have as a clearly recognized purpose the in-service education of the administrator." It is belatedly recognized that even this open request provided a restrictive framework and limited the freedom of the person to interpret in-service as he saw fit.

Nonetheless, despite the restriction, clear evidence of definitional and delimitational problems emerged. One respondent stated, "In presenting your paper you might call attention to the fact that it is difficult to distinguish between in-service education programs and field service assistance." It would seem desirable to push the definition for conceptual purposes even though the distinctions might not be meaningful operationally.

Learning may be assumed to be present in all human activity. Similarly teaching may be present in most situations where one person knows or thinks he knows what he believes others should know. A useful distinction between learning opportunities and in-service education opportunities might be the one of conscious learning purpose on the part of all concerned. Another might be that all in-service education experiences are planned rather than incidental to some other activity.

Responsibility. Who is responsible for in-service education of administrators? What agencies should play the major and which the minor role?

It would seem essential that this question be examined thoroughly so that guidelines for appropriate responsibility and activities might emerge. Is the primary responsibility best placed on the individual? The school district? The state department of education? The professional association? The university?

It is important that this question be considered without ties from the past and with due regard for the developing profession of administration. It would be quite easy, for example, for us to assume that the major responsibility should rest with the University. May I presume to suggest that this is by no means a given.

John Gardner's admonition that the ultimate goal must be to "shift to the individual the burden of pursuing his own education" is often quoted. Similarly we tend to agree with statements such as "Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and understandings are possessions which men acquire by themselves, not gifts which a company or a university can bestow." [3] Yet much of our behavior in in-service education seems to be inconsonant with these ideas.

Recently I have found myself questioning whether our own students and graduates have an adequate conception of what it means to be a lifelong learner and accept responsibility for it. And do they have a clear idea of what resources might be available and how they might be utilized. If we are succeeding, the individual should see himself on graduation as one who is embarking on a career of learning, possessed of the tools needed for the learning task.

I have found myself asking, too, whether our graduates know the nature of the kind of true helping relationship that is necessary for helping people who need or ask for help, whether individually or in small groups.

Who In a University Should Have the In-Service Education Role

Traditionally universities have not accepted the in-service education role. Professional schools are pushed strongly in this direction, however. Thus, they add to the traditional roles of research, teaching, and service the specialization of professional in-service education. Can we properly involve all our professors in this work? Should some specialize in it? Should it be part of the assignment or should the professor carry it as a consultancy and overload?

There is a distinct possibility that only a limited number of professors can adequately perform the disseminator role. Perhaps we should be selecting people with such skills. Indeed, if the growth in demand continues, we may have to set up special preparation programs for in-service professors or enlarge the competence of all.

What is Relevant. The greatest single problem which we continue to face well may be the one of determining what is useful to and relevant for the practicing administrator. The present welter of approaches and emphases confuses professors, let alone practitioners.

Needed is some pulling together of content and experiences upon which we might agree. Then there is need for massive attempts to pull from our own field and other relevant disciplines that which is meaningful to the profession and possible of dissemination through in-service education efforts.

Whence the Resources

Education has been slow to learn the value of the continuing investment in personnel. Only a trace of the budget has gone for this purpose. In the years ahead, one can look for increasing expenditures of this kind. Probably already we should be talking of a minimum of 10 per cent for this purpose. Of this, as much as 2 per cent might be earmarked for the development of administrative and supervisory personnel.

Under such circumstances one can expect an upsurge in emphasis on sabbatical leaves and administrator travel along with increased emphasis on programs tailored to local need. We can expect much greater discrimination on the part of school system personnel in the choice of activities; up to now many have faced only the choice among our competing conferences and workshops and professional meetings.

Universities should find it possible to support in-service activities from income derived from school districts. Development money should be sought from both government and foundation sources, however.

Perhaps I should indicate that the districts with which we work, without exception, have experienced no difficulty in getting the needed money from their boards. The tougher job is to convince administrators that they dare ask for it.

All This and In-Service Too!

Perhaps professors will think this exclamation is appropriate for them. And it is.

But it may be far more significant for the administrator on the job. These people, particularly the superintendents, are already seriously overworked in the size dimension of their jobs and harassed in the nature of it. Many want to participate in in-service activities but end up sending a representative.

The professor may have a genuine role to play in the reconceptualization of the superintendent's role and task. Somehow the administrator must come to see himself differently. He will not take time out for refresher work unless he sees this as essential and acceptable. Acting as consultants, professors can do a great deal to hasten the day when the administrator, no matter at what level in the hierarchy, will expect to spend from 10 to 20 per cent of his time doing what others in the society must do -- retooling.

We do nothing to enhance this idea by attempting to sandwich in our in-service activities or to compete out other minor activities. Much more likely to succeed are the sounder plans involving weeks and even months of removal from the job scene. We cannot expect those in the field to think any more adequately or any bigger than we do.

Theory and Conceptualization

The letters telling of in-service activity did not express any evidence of activity or even interest in developing theoretical or conceptual positions with respect to in-service education. Indeed one might be inclined to read the available evidence as saying that we know what needs doing but we have trouble finding the time and resources to do it.

In my view there is no greater error available to us than this. Our greatest need at this time is to rethink the whole question of administrative preparation, both pre- and in-service. Close examination and significant dialogue is likely to indicate that much of what we have been doing has been based on incorrect or inadequate assumptions. Unless I am grossly in error, we are likely to conclude that we can ill-afford the naive approaches which have characterized many of our efforts to date.

There may be little reason to be sanguine about our ability to develop comprehensive theories -- though I am pleased to see that we will be trying to do so here. There is no reason, however, why we cannot develop conceptual schemes. It might be that undertaking to write a comprehensive position paper would be the most fruitful approach.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps we can agree with Hamblin when he says, "Rather than discontent over the hiatus now clearly revealed to exist between present achievements and realizable goals somewhat closer to perfection, let us be pleased that we have at last gained the wisdom to know, with Pogo, that 'We have met the enemy, and he is us'." [5]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bernthal, William F. in Harold E. Moore, (Ed.), High Priority Areas in School Personnel Administration: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice. Tempe, Arizona: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, College of Education. Arizona State University, 1965.
2. For a fascinating account of an experience in attempting to introduce new approaches in Business Administration education and the resistance of students to it see Clark, James V., Education for the Use of Behavioral Science. Los Angeles: Institute for Industrial Relations, University of California, 1962.
3. Dill, W. R., Crowston, W. B. S., and Elton, E. J., "Strategies for Self-Education," Harvard Business Review, November - December, 1965.
4. Gardiner, John W., Self-Renewal New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963 .
5. Hamblin, Francis N., quoted in Journal of Teacher Education, December, 1964.
6. In-Service Education for School Administration. Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1963.
7. Willis, Benjamin C., "Continuing Education for Present Administrators," in Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley, (Eds.), Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

CHAPTER II

NOTES ON INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATOR

Keith Goldhammer

A fundamental characteristic of the professional man is that his professional education is never finished. It can also be hypothesized that the less tangible the content with which the professional man deals, the greater is his need for continuing education throughout his career. Of all the professions, the educational administrator probably deals with the least tangible and the least specific content. This paper begins, then, with the assumption that the ambiguity that pervades the practice of educational administration produces constant shifts in the technology and related knowledge base of the field -- and, in turn, necessitates constant concern for the in-service education of school administrators.

If the educational administrator is both a manager of a going concern and an educational leader, then it is apparent that his task is to maintain currency of knowledge both of administrative practices and educational programs. A majority of the specialists in educational administration have maintained that the educational administrator must, first of all, be an educator. They have refused to accept the proposal that administrators are interchangeable among functions and have stoutly defended the proposition that to the extent that school principals and superintendents are not educational specialists and leaders, the educational function of our society suffers proportionately. From the evidence, one might cynically state that to a large extent they are _not_ and it _does_.

Education has not been isolated from the major explosions that characterize the ethos of the 20th Century. We live in and are affected by the technological explosion. It is not entirely apparent just what adaptations need to be made both in the administrative and the educational functions, in order to benefit from basic technological developments of this age. The application of technology to both administrative and educational problems should relieve us from drudgery, enable us to have greater and more immediate accessibility to the information we need for decision-making, and provide the cues needed to improve the learning-teaching relationship. Slowness in developing applications and making the necessary adaptations gives evidence of the fact that we, as administrators, have not become fully enough aware of the possibilities that now exist and how they relate to our field.

Almost the same can be said about the knowledge explosion as it affects education and the work of school administrators. There is some evidence to support the contention that the tangible applications of new knowledge in education diffuse rather rapidly. Hence, we make a great stir about "the new math and science" even though evidence of their improvement over the "old" is neither tested nor assured. But new findings in learning psychology or the applications of behavioral scientific concepts to the processes of administration are slow to take hold. Administrators complain that they are so busy doing the housekeeping chores for the maintenance of the organizations that they don't have time to search for ways by which the drudgery of their chores can be reduced. The tangible applications are economically saleable through textbooks and the hardware associated with education. So the book salesman and the road-runner for the school supply houses become agents of the diffusion of educational innovations and technical developments. It is just plain hard work for the practitioner to apply knowledge to the procedures that he employs and to evaluate in some form the effectiveness with which he is able to operate. Besides, procedures are not economically valuable. Their use is not protected by copyright and patent regulations. They cannot, for the most part, be turned into saleable commodities which bring profits to those who invest capital in their development, refinement, and dissemination.

The application of new technical developments in the field of administration is similarly restricted. In the past twenty years, research and theory have provided some important new tools which can be used by the administrator to improve his effectiveness and to understand better the dynamics of the school organization, but these items seem to diffuse slowly for the same reasons that knowledge seems to be disseminated slowly in professional education.

Some Barriers to Improvement

Many reasons can be given for the persistence of this state of affairs. To understand the institutional adjustments that must be made to meet current demands for the improvement of educational administration, it is essential that we look at some traditional barriers that exist in the field of education.

First, the legal structure of education probably constitutes the greatest barrier to the continuous education of administrators. The school district is an independent branch of government, geographically dispersed throughout the state. Local control of education may have resulted in an emphasis of the resources that could be marshalled locally for education, but it has also created some problems which have severely restricted the adoption of educational innovations. The appointment of the school administrator, for example, has been a political process, and local school boards have not characteristically endeavored to employ administrators with ability and willingness to apply new knowledge to educational affairs or to maintain the adaptability of the school to current needs. The governmental isolation of the school district has fostered a spirit of independence among school administrators and created the impression that each administrator is a duke in his own little duchy as far as educational practices are concerned. His primary concern, it seems, is to maintain his acceptability in the local political arena rather than to give the type of educational leadership which would necessitate his constant search for applying the best knowledge and technical operations to the local organization. Relating less to the educational profession than to the local community and being professionally responsible to a lay board rather than to the peers of his profession, he has not been required to maintain his expertise, so essential a factor in other professions.

Second, the school administrator is protected from a great deal of the competitive struggle that characterizes the entrepreneurial professions. The practitioners in the entrepreneurial professions have to demonstrate their ability to use the most recent and the best methods in order to keep their clients and patients. They adopt new practices fairly rapidly because it is, for one thing, economically advantageous for them to do so. Not so the educational administrator. He realizes that in the local politics he may be more subject to adverse reaction if he is an innovator rather than a stabilizer of the status quo. The profession still accepts the adage that survival is the best measure of the effectiveness of the school administrator, and traditionally, the superintendent has not had to take in-service courses to learn survival tactics.

Third, the necessary instrumentalities for in-service education have been slow to emerge. Professional organizations have discussed the need for in-service education, but their programs have been traditional and not expertly devised for meeting the needs of the unique characteristics of the administrator. Educational organizations, too, have become more highly political in the state arena than concerned about the in-service education of their members, and professional meetings are characterized by inspirational lectures, exhortations on political problems and affairs, and reports of successful experiences of colleagues. Schools of education, which could play important roles, have been concerned with their acceptability and prominence rather than with the problems of the field, and their attention has been riveted more upon pre-service training and graduate degree programs than upon in-service education. Their training programs have been dominated more by the desire of education professors to achieve respectability in the academic community than to develop programs to meet realistic needs of the field. Professors strive to make their programs academically respected among their liberal arts colleagues and in accordance with the best medieval conceptions of the academic community rather than professionally significant in their field of operations. Increasingly, schools of education have become more concerned with the study of administration and the making of contributions to the theory of administration than with the development of technologies which can be employed successfully in the administration and organization of the public schools.

Fourth, one must also admit that there has been a deep gulf between the administrator in the field and the professor of administration in the college and university. Both roles have contributed to the persistence of this gulf, the professor, by leaning toward the academic field and his criticism of the expediency of the administrator, and the administrator by his reliance upon experience and rule-of-thumb rather than solid, conceptual foundations. While the professor has become increasingly interested in theory and the study of administrative processes, the administrator has had to remain concerned about the bricks and mortar of administration, the budgets and the public relations which are more visible to his employers than procedural technologies.

Finally, the shortage of administrative personnel within the schools has placed overwhelming burdens upon administrators so that they have had little time to devote to their in-service educational needs. School boards and school patrons have looked upon administrative staffs as a part of the overhead expense of the organization and have been reluctant to provide the number of administrators necessary to maintain the viability of the school organization. School administrators, consequently, are chained to their desks, and only on rare occasions are they able to get away during the academic year to participate in essential in-service educational functions. Universities have long acknowledged the importance of sabbatical leave programs to enable professors to gain greater currency of knowledge, and industry is now rapidly developing similar programs to prevent their key personnel from becoming professionally obsolescent. But if school districts have developed sabbatical leave programs for teachers, they are still, for the most part, reluctant to do so for administrators. The length of the work year for administrators has been steadily increasing, and school boards are now reluctant to release even their school principals during the summer months to attend training programs.

The development of the kinds of in-service educational programs that are required demand a removal of some of these barriers and the creation of instrumentalities through which in-service programs can be improved. It is now apparent that experience alone is an inadequate base upon which to establish a successful administrative career. The successful professional practitioner combines both experience and technical knowledge as a foundation upon which he builds his practice. The time has passed when administration could be taught upon the basis of experience, rules-of-thumb, the anecdotes of successful practitioners, or exhortation with respect to novel proposals or grandiose strategies. A vast body of knowledge based upon research, systematic theory, and the application of conceptual models is emerging both from research and theory. The administrator who wishes to compete on today's market finds himself pitted against men who have knowledge of the social forces and settings in which educational organizations operate. He has, and is increasingly expected to have, the knowledge necessary to predict the consequences of administrative actions and policy decisions. He is expected to know the means through which he can direct and operate an effective administrative organization. He cannot expect to operate in a setting in which his knowledge is static. New information is constantly being accumulated and reported. Investigators are steadily at work searching for new knowledge, and scholars are continuously seeking ways to perfect administrative performance through the applications of the findings of research from various disciplines to practice in educational administration. At the same time, we are finding changes in the composition of the school board and the expectations of the community. The composition of school boards has greatly changed in the last thirty years. There is increasing expectation for the school administrator to conduct himself as a true professional rather than as a local politician. There is increasing expectation on the part of citizens of the community for the administrator to give that kind of educational leadership to the community and to the staff, which will provide the maximum educational opportunities for their children.

But where does the administrator find time in his busy schedule to keep abreast of the knowledge explosion and, at the same time, direct changes in his school, plan the further development of the school program, operate the extensive programs already in existence, evaluate what is happening in the schools, and keep the lid on community relations. The answer is, "He probably doesn't."

New relationships between the administrator and his job, between the professional organization and the administrator, and between the institution of higher education and the field are essential if the administrator is to have the opportunity to keep abreast of the knowledge developments of his field.

Some Essential Adaptations Within Local School Systems

The most immediate imperative for local school districts to assure up-to-date knowledge and practice is the evaluation and the redefinition of the procedures by which local school districts select school administrators. Intensive efforts must be made to define the characteristics of the administrator who today can give the kind of leadership which school districts and communities require. The popularity of a local teacher is no longer a good criterion for this kind of leadership. The new educational leader must be defined in terms of his competency to operate in the three task areas defined by Katz -- the human, the technical, and the conceptual. Selection procedures need to be worked out within each school district to select administrators who are not only complementary to the administrative team, but are also knowledgeable and competent in all of these areas.

In the second place, it is apparent that within the administrative hierarchy itself, some new administrative roles must emerge. In the developing size of the current school district, the total job of in-service education cannot be done through the relationship of the school district to outside agencies. Research departments, departments of development and training, personnel assigned to the preparation of educational materials, workshops, and conferences, and the maintenance of open channels of communication are all essential aspects of a contemporary organization. There is need to define roles for the infusion of new ideas into the organization. There is also a need to create new administrative positions that will serve the function of evaluating current procedures and bring to the attention of the staff pertinent knowledge that will assist them in their own evaluations.

In the third place, both short and long term leaves of absence of school administrators for study, observation, and participation in program development are essential. School districts can no longer afford to view sabbatical leaves as privileges given to a few of the staff because of services rendered. Developmental leaves for study and planning are needed for the introduction of new ideas and new educational knowledge, and should be regarded as features essential to the continuous self-renewal of the school organization.

But not all of the school district's need for new knowledge can be met through these devices. Arrangements must be made constantly for administrators to be released from routine assignments for short periods of time in order to participate in the study and the development of projects within the school district itself. One of the best techniques for staff in-service education is participation in local developmental programs, but this participation can have nothing but a wearing effect upon the staff if it is done in the late afternoon and evening. Provision must be made within the local school district for releasing those members of the staff who are studying ways and means of applying new knowledge to local problems. Obviously, it is imperative that the number of administrators within the school organization be increased to be able to provide for programs of continuous evaluation and development and still maintain effective operation of the schools.

Some Essential Adaptations for Professional Organizations

Professional organizations can help to create the conditions under which professional in-service education programs become more generally accepted throughout the field. They can accomplish this end both independently and through their relationships with colleges and universities. The emerging pattern of their concerns might take several different directions.

It would not be unrealistic for professional organizations to promote in-service education by redesigning conferences and conventions. Good cases in point toward the accomplishment of these ends are some of the program innovations attempted by both the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Department of Elementary School Principals. The ASCD conventions are characterized by work and study groups with the major emphasis placed upon utilizing knowledge resources to help build perspectives for critical problems facing the participants.

By sponsoring research conferences regionally and locally, ASCD has helped to train local supervisors and curriculum specialists in the techniques of knowledge utilization and the development of local strategies for the employment of these resources to improve school programs. Probably more than any other professional group, the membership of ASCD is oriented toward the maintenance of professional obligations to participate in extensive and well-devised in-service educational program, and it is interesting to note that the major motivation for this participation springs from the individual's identification with the legitimated goals of the organization to which he belongs.

The Department of Elementary School Principals has experimented through their national convention with the use of simulated materials and films as a part of an in-service education, and although their utilization of these techniques has not been as extensive as the programs developed by ASCD in extending into regional and local levels, they have stimulated a desire to pursue the use of these materials on the part of the membership and in relationship with other agencies.

Revitalizing conferences and conventions in this fashion can, of course, have a very important impact upon the professional utilization of existing knowledge, but in addition to this, professional organizations can make available to their membership many more types of publications than is currently the case. Publications based upon the application of knowledge rather than the purely exhortative or conceptual can help to develop an essential perspective toward scientific investigation and the application of the knowledge derived through such research to the problems of education. Our experience in the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration shows that there is a considerable hunger for such publications on the part of the contemporary educator, and with modest advertising efforts, a crescendo of sales can be achieved. Although it is impossible to foretell the impact that such publications might have, it is apparent that they are being read and used by many administrators.

Some professional organizations outside the field of education today have the requirement that the individual must participate continuously in specified in-service educational programs in order to maintain his membership. This is done not for the purpose of maintaining operations of the professional organization but of assuring the highest degree of professional knowledge among the members. Much of the in-service training consists of small study groups supported by contributions from the members themselves, whereby new materials in the field are reviewed and technicians are brought in to teach the latest techniques that have been developed. Technological advances are studied along with new developments in research and theory. Professional organizations in education would make an important contribution if they would encourage similar professional activities on the part of educators and align themselves with the expertise that exists in colleges and universities in order to accomplish these ends.

Some Essential Adaptations in Universities and Colleges

One of the most essential adaptations that must be made in the contemporary university is the re-definition of staffing practices in departments of educational administration. For many years it was considered essential for a staff member in a department of educational administration to have experience as a superintendent of schools in a fairly good-sized school district. Increasingly, the emphasis has shifted so that today there is more endeavor to secure staff members who have had research and theoretical training rather than the practical school experience. Unquestionably, there is a place for both within the department. The practitioner is needed to help individuals gain insight into the immediate problems of administration and to help the neophyte see the effects produced by various types of administrative interventions. On the other hand, the researchers and theoreticians are extremely important in furthering the study of administration and helping both to promote greater emphasis upon study and to assist the young administrator to identify those variables that are most significant to his success. The effective department of educational administration will encompass both areas of concern and provide professors with both orientations an opportunity to work together on courses and seminars as well as field projects.

But it seems now that a dangerous bifurcation can take place as a result of these two somewhat, but not entirely, compatible functions. A third type of practitioner is also necessary. Staff members are needed who can relate most effectively to the in-service needs of school administrators by making the applications of knowledge to the practical problems of school administration. This man might be considered the developmental scholar or the translator, as Roald Campbell describes the role. This is the man who stands between the practitioner and the researcher and who has enough familiarity with the theoretical and research literature to be able to point up implications for administrative practice and to develop the proper strategies for administrative action that derives from the findings of research and theory.

A further adaptation of the university is needed to accept the activities of the in-service trainer as academically respectable. Extensive participation with excellence in such programs should receive the same consideration for academic promotion as work in research and publication. If the university is to legitimate a series of differentiated functions, then it must certainly be prepared to maintain and reward differentiated roles within it.

Contemporary needs of administrators for in-service education extend beyond the range of competencies that are normally found within even the large department of educational administration. Consequently, the university should develop instrumentalities through which the total resources of the university can be employed, as necessary, to accomplish in-service educational goals. Such agencies as bureaus of school services, study councils, and educational research centers can play important roles in the in-service educational program. Traditional school surveys and studies can be improved by incorporating the findings of research from other disciplines. This means that the agency, whether it be a service bureau or a study council, can become a vehicle for marshalling the resources of the university for their effective employment in the in-service educational programs of school administrators. Members of other departments can be incorporated on teams that are working with school administrators, helping to evaluate phases of the school program or developing instructional materials that can be used by school administrators in satisfying their educational requirements.

The functions of these instrumentalities are such that they cannot be employed exclusively in the routine operations of the normal school or department. It is not sufficient that they offer courses. Their programs need not, and should not, be tied down to the normal university culture of credits, grades, and the other paraphernalia associated with the academic rituals. Short training courses are essential. Conferences reporting research and implications for immediate problems are important. The provision of time for professors to work with school administrators in small study groups would probably be an excellent innovation in helping to accomplish major objectives, but much of this work must be done away from the university center and closer to the field, in order that individuals can participate near their homes without losing a considerable amount of time in travel. This may require that a major university establish throughout a state in-service education centers jointly staffed by school districts and the major training institution. In such centers the major responsibility of the university would be to provide expert guidance for the continuing in-service educational programs, to teach the initial phases of the pre-service educational program, and to conduct the field operations phases of research programs engaged in by the university. An essential aspect of this type of center might be that while the university establishes arrangements for the in-service education of practicing administrators in the field, it is also structuring a means for using the experienced administrators as a part of the pre-service training program in educational administration. The centers might play important roles in the identification, screening, selection, and initial training of these young men and women in education who should become school administrators.

The university may also find it necessary to make some important adaptations in its normal routines in order to develop effective programs for administrators who have received sabbatical or developmental leaves. Not all such individuals can realistically make the most effective use of their time by taking courses or entering degree programs. A flexibility is needed which might enable them to work in small groups or on an individual basis with professors on their own projects related to the needs of their school districts. Such an opportunity is more important than accumulating so many hours of credit, acquiring research competencies which they will never use, and having a dissertation writing experience which will never be repeated.

The problem for the university is that of making its resources available in such form that they can be readily employed by local school districts. The problem for the university is that of utilizing its resources effectively to help accomplish important objectives for the field of education rather than merely maintaining its own course and degree structure. The accomplishment of this end will necessitate some major adaptations in the perspective and regulations of most modern universities. Individuals may be brought in to work, not in the academic segment of the university, but in the service bureau or study council.

Administrators may come to use the resources of the university to secure professional counseling from members of the staff, but not to take a course. A professor may fulfill the major part of his responsibility to the university by working with a group of administrators in a field study club. Another staff member of the university may not be assigned to the campus at all because his work is primarily in a field center of the university where he relates himself to the people in the field and conducts the university's in-service training and developmental programing in a direct relationship with the clientele in a remote geographical area.

Conclusion

The career of the school administrator may span twenty-five or thirty years. During that period of time, major changes in the knowledge base, the practicing technology, and the basic practices of the field will take place. The educational administrator who does not take time during his career for re-education and re-orientation, is likely to become professionally obsolescent within a decade. One cannot wait for a new crop of administrators to arise. Schools must remain open, and the social requirements for improved education demand constantly improved administrative leadership.

The job of in-service education is too complex and extensive for any one agency to perform all of the functions that are required. Cooperative and coordinated endeavors between school districts, professional organizations, and training institutions are needed in order to achieve the desired results. Leadership, however, must be taken by the universities if the educational innovations which are needed are to be created. The modern medical school allocates at least as much of its resources to in-service education as to pre-service education. If our society is to be adequately served by its schools, the departments of educational administration throughout the country can do no less.

CHAPTER III

INTER-INSTITUTIONAL MODEL FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND CHANGES IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Patrick D. Lynch

In-service training of school administrators has long been characterized largely by classes of one kind or another, either on campuses or in extension settings. I wish in this paper to enlarge this concept somewhat and to discuss in-service training as an organizational problem, demanding complementary institutional roles, and accompanying institutional changes.

In discussing training we are discussing change of behavior -- change of administrator behavior -- hence we have to be concerned with how we in universities, in educational administration, can help administrators change their behavior.

Kurt Lewin and Paul Grabbe, in a paper entitled "Conduct, Knowledge and Acceptance of New Values", which appeared in the Journal of Social Issues in August 1945, described re-education as an organizational process. They pointed out that change in behavior most effectively and economically occurs in a context -- that context which gives the person his role identity. Re-education at once is individual and social. The establishment of an "in group" -- a group in which the members feel belongingness -- enhances the learning dynamics. A social system becomes a learning system in which individuals in it discover together new systems of values and beliefs leading to action. It is most difficult to change beliefs and values in piecemeal fashion, individual by individual.

As we discuss in-service training we discuss re-training. The learning group in which the individual leaves his working environment to go to a classroom setting, following a sequence of conceptual steps outlined by an instructor would not appear to be as powerful a means of changing that individuals' behavior as would learning which takes place in the individuals' own work group, on his own ground, where barriers to his change in behavior can be recognized, discussed, and attacked by himself with members of his own work group. Such a concept of course is not new. Re-training in industry takes place in this way.

Work Groups As In-Service Training

Extension efforts have often proceeded in such a way that several teachers in a building take a course together in that building. What is suggested as being more effective is creation of a work group, including the administrator, attacking problems as they are in reality, namely as system problems. It is clear that a mere exploration of new concepts by such a group is not sufficient to change behavior, either of the administrator or other participants in the system. The exploration of new concepts is, however, necessary. The organization of a learning group as a work group attacking system problems, which are perceived as real and pressing, would seem most appropriate to allow the use of new concepts to solve existing problems in the system.

Organizing such work groups in school systems allows another barrier to change to be attacked. Lippit, Watson and Westley in The Dynamics of Planned Change identify this barrier as the interrelation of parts. If one actor, or participant, of an organization is ready for change, while other actors are not ready, or committed, friction develops which is extremely powerful. Threat is perceived almost at once by the uninitiated as the actor who wishes to be a change agent attempts to reorganize the structure or to move other actors. Hence, a better solution than bringing in administrators one by one from various systems to attempt to make change agents of them is to work with them in their organizational setting with other actors who will become in that organization an ingroup committed to change.

The change group which we are now discussing can examine together with the outside agent, from the university, the stereotypes which they possess of the organization and its environment, and together they can work at alternative solutions and change the stereotypes which they possess.

The first model of change suggested is classroom learning model in which the professor is the change agent and the clients are graduate students. The limits of such a model are those operating in any self-contained classroom, depending upon cognitive changes in the client with, behavior change in the various clients' systems a possibility, depending on the power of transfer elements present in the client, and as we know constricted by resistance factors in each client's individual personality and in his system. The group process operating in such a context is a function of the individuals working, at best, on problems relevant to their own systems but at some distance from others in their own work groups. The extension course organized in the school system with several actors in the system offers the possibility of a work group's analyzing problems of change within their system. If selectivity is not used in bringing key actors together in the learning situation, however, the possibility for effecting change in the system is reduced.

What is being suggested here is an approach which can use many existing inter-institutional resources, of which extension classes are only one. The university as an agent of change needs, on its part, to alter its stereotypes of itself and its environment, and I will return to this theme later. Other in-service re-education possibilities have long existed in field service organizations, and more recently in school study councils. The first of these, the field service bureau, has long been geared to a more limited change dynamic. I will explore this because it embodies some assumptions, and stereotypes, which have hindered its effectiveness in changing client school systems.

Field Service Bureau Model

The field service bureau in its traditional methodology employs 3 basic elements: (a) the field survey conducted by an outside individual or group, (b) the outside expertise, sold to the client system, and (c) recommendations for future action presented by the outside agent.

The survey in its traditional form, conducted by outside agents was not an instrument which in itself was conceptualized as a change variable, but was a study of the status of the organization and its environment. Predictions were made only supposing that past and present trends continue into the future. The community's resistance to the survey information was not considered, but often became a factor which vitiated the entire survey attempt. However, a newer concept used by some survey bureaus taught the community to study itself and predict its own needs. This method nevertheless required the services of the expert to pull data together and make a pattern of it, extrapolating trends.

The school system purchased the service of outside expertise to advise it on a course of change. The interaction between the outside agent and the system took place almost entirely between the superintendent or his designated aides and the outside experts. This interaction became often more of a game than a learning situation. If the superintendent and board asked for a study of the system, the superintendent allowed the outside experts to go into the system, study data, and make conclusions without influence or assistance of the staff. So the conclusions were those of the outsider, not the insiders. That left the insiders free to reject any or all of the recommendations, because the insiders who bought the service could claim superior knowledge, unavailable to the outsiders. Interactions between the survey experts and the actors in the system were guarded and limited. There was no imperative on the part of the clients to learn the techniques of the study or necessarily to learn anything more about themselves.

More important than the procedure of such a survey was the reason for the calling in of the outside agent to conduct a survey. Typically, the reason was an anticipated building of a school with its antecedent bond issue. In order to sell the community on the necessity for an additional bond levy, it was presumed that the calling in of outside "impartial" experts would convince the citizenry with an objective appraisal of the situation. The possibilities for in-service training of administrators and staff during such a period are great. At this time the period of potential stress in the system could be the means for convincing the key actors in the organization that change is necessary in the curriculum and structure of the school district. However, if the school system saw only the necessity for buying expertise on a limited scale and the university consultant service was limited to a short-term appraisal and recommendation, the administrators could feel quite safe in preserving as much as possible of the status quo intact. The scope of such a survey limited to technical service would miss the opportunity of more thorough-going and fundamental change.

The school survey or technical recommendation offered by a university as the change agent to the client provides a model in which both the client and change agent agree to limit the scope of the change possibility. The problem is a specific one which calls for few, if any, organizational changes in the client system, and limited commitment on the part of the change agent or university. In this model an effort is made to change for a brief time the school system's environment just enough to secure a favorable bond issue vote with a minimum of information offered (all favorable to the school system except the amount of floor space) on the premise that an affirmative vote will allow "all systems to be go." There is an assumption on the part of the client that the change agent will not expect more change in the system than is required to secure the approval of the public for this immediate building phase. There is an assumption on the part of the change agent that the client will not exert more energy than is required to elicit and publicize enough data from the system to show the need for the recommended number of dollars for the required additional floor space. Both client and change agent keep their respective distance from others in the opposite systems who might disrupt the process and broaden the scope of the change desired. Left untouched in the client systems are the nature of the curriculum in the existing school buildings, the organization of the school district, and the relationship of the district to the social environment. Touched lightly are the relationship of the school district to the economic environment, and only enough to show that higher bond levies are possible, and the relationship of the district to the political environment, at most going through necessary legal processes and packaging an issue to elicit one-shot majority approval. Attended to in more detail are the curriculum in the new building and administrative organization for the new or remodeled school building. At best the latter is a process referred to as the drawing up identification of educational specifications which determine the layout of the new plant. With some imagination this can involve the in-service training of an entire faculty and administration; more typically it is the work of a small group designated to confer hurriedly with an architect of limited imagination and great negative persuasion.

The personal interactions in such a process are mostly dyadic. The roles of the change agent's institution restrict him to playing a very limited role in the client community and system. His interactions with groups are almost always few and formal with the air of convincing them on a course of action rather than studying alternatives and the consequences for the entire client system. Time is limited; the contract allows only a very few professors brief visits to the client district, leaving short written reports with the survey team director.

In any situation where a client calls in an outside agent to provide a technical service the role of the outside agent is restricted to serving only on a limited problem, for a limited time, with minimal impact for change upon the system and its environment. The outside technician is not called upon to help revise or reform the system, or retrain its personnel, but to keep the system intact, and to serve to protect its status from undue influence by the environment. The outside agent, in turn, is not committed to changing himself or his own institution. He is committed to performing a technical role, one which is well-structured and understood as limited, and well-defined expertise. The number of outside agents available from his institution to study the client institution may be large, but few are called upon, and those few are those who understand and accept a technical expert's role in the client organization. The institution (university) as the outside agent, then, exhibits a commitment to the client institution which is limited in time, scope, and energy.

The technical expert who is summoned to provide a well defined and limited service too often must accept the definition of the system and its environment as given by the client. There is little time to question the perceptions of the client and the possibilities which exist to accomplish changes in the system. As the outsider serves in such a role he finds it difficult to convince the client of the inadequacies he might discover in the system, let alone to try to change perceptions of the client. If the outsider does not question these perceptions he is driven to accept the same solution as the client, which in fact may lead to a further deterioration in the environmental climate -- for example a refusal of the voters to approve the bond issue and a further loss of face by the administrator and board of educators.

Effects in the University

The university bureaucratizes this service thus compartmentalizing it and protecting the rest of the university from change which might flow from such school-university relationships. The tendency of the university to erect service bureaus has the effect of creating specialized service-oriented staffs who in the climate of the university have little impact upon their colleagues for anything more than brief and restricted inter-institutional relationships. As service bureaus are delegated the task of relating to school districts, the great majority of the university academic staff are untroubled by any requirement to establish long-term relationships with school systems or their administrators, with the consequence that neither party will have much chance to change the other's behavior. We have, then, a troubled and continuing dialogue in the university centering around whether service is respectable, how much time a professor can afford to allot to service and still remain academically respectable.

I do not wish to deprecate the contribution of field service bureaus, for they have assisted school districts greatly in fulfilling needs the districts recognized. What I suggest is that the model of the field service bureau or similar agencies to house technical services to schools has tended not to perform an in-service training function for the administrators and staffs in the client school systems to the extent that those school personnel would be tempted to change their own systems. Rather, the organization of service bureaus has tended to insulate both client school system and university against changes in either system, and has tended to stereotype the inter-institutional role. The possibilities for re-training of administrators, using the school survey and school planning vehicles, are great, provided different kinds of relationships between systems can be established.

Inter-Institutional Model

In suggesting an alternative model to that of the service bureau or extension class for in-service training of administrators, I will suggest an inter-institutional model, in which the university interacts with a school system with each committed to change. Rather than one individual being hired away for a day or two from the university in a system to individual relationship, we would have a continuing system to system contact. The school administrator would not leave his own system to learn elsewhere, but would work and learn there. Nor would he be an onlooker while the change agents gave his system a once-over. The university people would work with the administrator in his system, conduct research into the problem area and learn with the local school people how to solve system problems. The change agent is called upon to enter the client system to plan changes with the client desired in the system.

The change process must recognize the 3 classic Lewinian steps in administrative change: unfreezing, moving to a new position, and freezing. They must be recognized as necessarily operating in both client system and university if the administrator is to be trained to be a change agent. Lippit and his colleagues point out that between the unfreezing and moving steps is another which applies to an outside agent-client relationship -- that of establishing a change relationship. Both agent and client have to agree that the university (or agent's) role is that of helper and diagnostician as well as confidant and adviser. The change agent's role is more diffuse than that of the technical adviser, operates over a longer period of time, and is composed of not one but probably several university people who are involved because of their interests and skills. The composition of such a university team might not be clear at the outset because the administrator has not yet visualized what kinds of problems will be identified in the change process. So the structure of the change agent's role and team are necessarily looser.

The first step in the process, that of unfreezing, comes from a need on the part of the client system to change -- possibly because the administrator wishes to do something more than preserve or tinker with his system. The disposition to move, or unfreeze, is one that must be present if the university is to commit itself and its staff to inter-institutional involvement.

Selectivity is necessary on the part of the university in this kind of in-service training. Not all school systems can be so served. Those with unfreezing potential and disposition constitute one population where maximum effects might be accomplished in re-formation of staff. Those school systems with "spread potential" constitute another, perhaps overlapping, population. As a university staff perceives its own impact area, it has to observe and judge the influence and impact of the various school systems in that area as being only local or greater than local. We need research on this topic badly -- what are the school systems which exert influence on other school systems. Size of system may be a factor in the influence network, or personality and effectiveness of the chief administrator may be another. We need as an outcome of such research to possess reliable methods for judging school districts and their administrators with respect to such influence.

In-service education of administrators can take place in a systemwide study in which the university and its team becomes the change and re-training agent.

The client system, after making the decision to unfreeze and establish the change relationship is ready to move -- to explore directions and rationale for various courses of action, to explore resistance in the system and its environment, to summon perhaps other outside agents who might become part of the change team. In analyzing the problems of certain client systems it will become necessary to involve other resources than those of a university to assist the school and community in changing the environment. Federal and state resources today are abundant, but many communities cannot tap them because they do not have the knowledge or skills available. As the client system desires change in itself, it may have to accompany this process with change in its community environment. In order to do this certain tasks become apparent among which is the analysis of community organization. Formation of community leadership is one of the most pressing needs in rural communities and urban poor areas, and this process is one in which the client system and the university would have to share talent and responsibility.

Re-structuring of the system, or freezing of the change is Lewin's third step, and the fourth according to Lippitt. Again, if the client system has worked to change its community, re-structuring of the environment may be called for so that the greatest possible chance exists for the changes to take effect.

The final step in the process is achieving a terminal relationship. The change agent cannot remain indefinitely in the client system, but he can remain until the system and its administrators have demonstrated change capability and actual movement. The learning of change can be recognized as the desired residual. Continued dependency upon the change agent will vitiate the client systems' capability to solve its own problems. This is not to preclude the change agent's re-entry into the client system later for a new purpose, with new administrators to train and renewed necessity to obtain a base for change of educational practice in the university's area of influence. As a matter of course the university ought to study the effectiveness of its relationship with clients to determine what kinds of dynamics are necessary to operate in order to secure modifications in client systems and communities.

Three other principles can be applied in this model. One, mentioned previously, is the greater effectiveness of the work group for changing behavior in individuals over the cognitive-oriented classroom model, or the dyad as outside agent advising client concerning techniques to be followed. A second concerns risk-taking behavior. Bem, Wallach and Kogan point out that group decisions tend to be more risky, given the same environment, than decisions made by individuals of that same group. This implies that, given a work group in the environment, change attempts are more likely to be taken than would be the case if the same individuals were not formed into a task group. The implications for in-service training are that the administrator needs some possibility of group support before he can take the risk of becoming a change agent in his system.

A third principle is the necessity for the advocate in accomplishing change in the system. Mathew Miles has elucidated this theme. It might follow that the greater the prestige of the advocate or sponsor, the greater the possibility for change, which would imply that a university with its tradition of excellence could be a more powerful sponsor than could a participant in the client system, no matter how high he might be in that system. Now combine the university with the administrator and a work team and the sponsorship is even more powerful. This combination presumes that the university is willing to play such a role. This is a big if, for the closer the university's ties are to status forces, either in the profession, or in the community, the more risk the university perceives in providing sponsorship for change. Conversely, the university is usually in a much safer position to fulfill this role than is any other group.

Accommodations in the University

Accompanying the change in the client system hopefully would be a change in the university. Resistive as universities are to change within themselves, this will be as difficult a task as changing client systems and their administrators. Re-education of university administrators and staffs is called for at the same time. The university college of education structure with its well-defined boundaries between service units and academic functions, with well defined boundaries among disciplines and sub-disciplines need not be an obstacle to changing its own service and training functions. But interactions among service, research, and teaching-oriented staff need to be expanded and the rewards for each need to be re-defined. Research in community change and training of leaders must accompany the process described herein. Teaching of school administrators and staffs need improvement. Service functions need the stimuli from research and teaching theorists.

A university administrator can work with the existing structure through administration of rewards to accomplish greater interaction within his college, or he can work toward re-structuring the organization so that academic departments are not protected from or prevented from application of research to service, or he can create new combinations of service to clients and research and teaching. It may be that departmentalization into academic and service departments may not be optimal, but organization of a staff around task forces with changes of personnel and function from time to time is possible. Another possibility is for service bureau units to include in their staff members of the academic departments. A clear delineation between service, research and teaching functions may be the biggest organizational barrier of all to inter-institutional relationships. It is difficult to relegate permanently only a small part of the university's staff in the foregoing model to assisting client systems and changing administrators if this process is to be anything more than a marginal effort of the university.

Imperatives for extended inter-institutional relationships are re-definition of the credit and grading system in terms of classroom hours, although this now appears to be a much smaller obstacle than formerly. Naming the learning experience is a favorite game in universities, but if new names are resisted, old bottles can handle the new product, so long as the content can somehow be communicated. University-client relationships can be tied up by committees' haggling over such details. Perhaps we need to cast off in educational administration from the need to label in-service training by course names, numbers, and grades. If recognition in terms or grade points for this is needed, a block of hours awarded under a problem will serve the requirement. In-service responsibilities in a profession should not require credits, necessarily.

More important is the recognition given by the university in terms of staff time and resources for significant inter-institutional relationships. The most significant contribution to educational change in your host institution occurred as a result of the relationship between a department in the college of education and 2 elementary schools in the 1930's and 40's under the direction of Dr. Lloyd Tireman. Educational leaders trained in these projects are a live and valuable residual, two of whom are Frank Angel and Marie Hughes. In this effort, research, teaching, and service over a period of several years were combined to achieve maximum change effects. The spread of practice from the 2 elementary schools into other school systems was not great and immediate, but there can be traced a delayed effect as a result of the impact of people trained in the projects.

As inter-institutional relationships with only one or two technical objectives give way to relationships with longer range, more diffused (but nevertheless observable) objectives, the university will have to recognize greater ambiguity of service roles, a wider breadth of objectives, and staff responsibilities different from the strictly observed academic roles. The administration professor may well be working on curriculum objectives and measurement, teacher effectiveness, rather than only on school finance and personnel management, for example. This is not to imply that the process is without identifiable or measurable objectives. Instead it means that objectives can be systemwide or community wide, and that the measurement process would require more creativity for analysis.

Increasingly, the need for reconstruction of school systems and their communities requires the best in academic talent and requires inter-disciplinary research efforts. "Pure" research is a chimera in any case, and the better the researcher the more his talents are needed in solving community action problems. The greater, too, can be his impact upon re-forming school and community administrators. What I have said about rural communities applies equally to urban communities. Their needs are staggering. The university must attempt to form school and community leadership which can recognize the need for change and realize the behavior necessary to accomplish that change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bem, Daryl, Wallach, Michael A., and Kogan, Nathan, "Group Decision Making under Risk of Aversive Consequences," J. of Pers. and Social Psych., Vol. 1, No. 5, May 1965, pp. 453-461.

2. Bidwell, Charles E., "The School As a Formal Organization," in James G. March, (Ed.), Handbook of Organizations, Rand McNally, 1965.

3. Culbertson, Jack and Hencley, Stephen, Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives, UCEA, 1962.

4. Leu, Donald J., and Rudman, Herbert, Preparation Programs for School Administrators, Michigan State U., 1963.

5. Lewin, Kurt, and Grabbe, Paul,"Principles of Re-education," pp. 503-509, in Bennis, Benne, and Chin (Eds.), Planning of Change: Readings in the Applied Behavioral Sciences, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

6. Lippitt, Watson, and Westley, The Dynamics of Planned Change, Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1958.

7. Stogdill, Ralph M., Individual Behavior and Group Achievement, Oxford U. Press, 1959.

CHAPTER IV

CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION

Reginald Fitz

I think most of you know something about medical education, but by way of a very brief review, people are admitted into medical school after they have been to college. They attend four years of medical school, following which they get an M.D. degree. In order to get a license to practice medicine it is necessary to take an internship in a hospital which provides accredited internships, and after the internship in most states one can apply for a license. In order to get a license, one has to pass a state examination for this particular function. Most physicians do not go into practice directly after an internship but continue in education beyond the internship for from one to five years. This period, which is known as a residency, may be in general practice or may be in any one of the numerous medical specialities and subspecialities. The actual time involved in training the physician before he goes into practice averages four, or at least three years, beyond the time that he gets his M.D. degree.

Looking at it in terms of age, I suppose an average age for getting out of high school would be 18, college 22, medical school 26, and getting into practice 30. By that time most physicians are married, have started a family, and have engaged themselves in practice of their branch of medicine in a given community. They have, then, roughly from the age of 30 to the age of 70, or whenever they happen to stop practicing, about 40 years in which they then presumably have to be delivering up-to-date medicine to the patients who seek their professional services.

The administration of medical education from the standpoint of a technical procedure is really fairly simple to explain in the context of the medical school itself. Most medical schools are parts of universities. Most medical schools have deans. Some of these deans are also vice-presidents for health affairs or have a similar title. The faculties of medical schools are divided into departments which have chairmen. Most medical school deans work with an executive committee which is comprised of these departmental chairmen, so that it is a line, military kind of organization set in an academic parameter. The Dean is, within the function of his school, in most instances relatively autonomous, with the exception that he reports directly to the central administration of the university. All academic appointments are processed through whatever academic screening device the parent university has established.

There are some differences from medical school to medical school. In the first place there are a number of medical schools which are not associated with universities. Secondly, a great many medical schools that are associated with universities are not on the university campus. There is another variable that is pretty hard to pin down, that is not at all consistent from one school to another. This relates to the so-called teaching hospital. Many medical schools or the universities that operate them have their university-owned teaching institutions. Others, such as Harvard, and several of the independent schools, actually utilize affiliative agreements with teaching hospitals, which are then accessible to the medical schools but are not owned by them. I think the general pattern in state university medical schools tends to be that the school or the university owns and operates its own teaching hospital or operates the state university hospital, depending what semantics are used to describe this institution.

In addition to the primary teaching hospital with which the medical school has a major relationship, there are frequently other affiliated teaching hospitals. These may be in the same general area, or 50 miles away, the pattern for this kind of relationship varies a good deal. Not infrequently there is a Veterans Administration in the neighborhood of the medical school and then the Veterans Administration hospital may become a primary teaching hospital, the administration of which from the standpoint of the medical school is mediated through what is known as the dean's committee. By this mechanism, the dean is usually the chairman of the dean's committee. Several faculty members, and usually one or two practicing physicans in the area, are on the dean's committee. All of the appointments to the staff of the hospital have to be approved by the dean's committee, as the relationship is a close one. The dean's committee controls the professional, educational, and research activities of the hospital as well. It then functions very much as a specific university teaching hospital with all the bills being paid by the Veterans Administration. This has a lot of advantages from the point of view of the quality of care that is given to the veteran patients and it also provides a very substantial increase in resources to the medical school from the point of view of teaching in clinical areas.

Over and above the task of teaching medical students, interns and residents, medical schools have a major involvement in Ph.D. education in the various medical sciences, although they don't get involved with Masters' programs very much. This may be a categorical Ph.D. in "medical sciences" or it may be a specific Ph.D. in some academic area such as anatomy, biochemistry, physiology, or microbiology.

Beyond these programs, medical schools are involved in the education of various paramedical disciplines. These include X-ray technologists, physical medicine, rehabilitation technologists, occupation therapists, medical social workers,psychiatric social workers, and laboratory technicans. These really involve quite an extensive teaching program; particularly when the medical center has reached maturity. Indeed, these programs that the medical school administers may be distributed and operate in more than one hospital and in more than one area. Thus the university tag can be placed on programs that operate in hospitals in which the relationship might not be at all apparent to someone who just took a casual glance at what was happening in a given hospital.

This kind of relationship is very much sought after by hospitals, for several reasons. Hospitals themselves face an accreditation procedure, and if they have a university affiliation this is usually almost automatic because the hospital has made itself subject to the disciplinary qualitative screen that a university supplies. One can assume, then, that the level of medical care will be better than in a hospital which has no such connection. This is not necessarily the case but it appears to be an assumption that generally has substance.

Beyond these groups which represent, in a sense, the formal training program the medical schools have taken as a major responsibility post-graduate or continuing medical education for those physicians who, as I mentioned, after the age of 30 have about 40 years to spend in the profession trying to keep abreast of the rapid turn-over in the resources which are available to patients. In this matter of administering post-graduate medical education, one has really a major problem. It can go on in the university hospital; this is, I think, the focus. It can happen in other hospitals that are affiliated with the university. It certainly happens in teaching teams from the medical school faculty of the medical center, which visit hospitals in an area, though they may have no connection at all with the medical school of the university. It goes on in medical meetings. State medical society meetings have scientific programs, and these are usually staffed by, or resourced from, people who are on medical school faculties. This is an effort in which the AMA is very much interested and into which it thrusts a tremendous amount of energy.

It has to be done effectively or the results of what happens in the laboratory and in the teaching hospital will never get translated to the practicing physican and to the patient who needs this kind of resource to be made available. A good many areas, including, I think, New Mexico, are just beginning to do this. There has been considerable development in automation in terms of medical education, particularly post-graduate medical education. There are extensive TV networks with two-way linkages and combined two-way audio whereby one can, in effect, hold a clinic in one hospital and have the physicians in another hospital be active audience participants in a teaching clinical environment. This is something developing more and more, and is about the only way you can effectively solve this problem in a state which has as many linear miles between various centralized areas as New Mexico. I think that this obviously is important in terms of other elements of education within the states if we are going to be at all efficient in giving people the opportunity to keep abreast of what is happening.

Now most of the faculty on a medical school are full time. There are many people who are in practice in the community who participate in these teaching and training efforts, but most of the faculty actually hold membership in national organizations and attend national meetings. The results of recent research are all reported at national meetings before they get into journals and the faculty themselves have a real investment in productive research, in creative scholarship if you want to look at it that way, on their own part. This interchange of ideas at national or regional meetings, then, feeds back to this system for post-graduate education and presumbly gets to the practicing physician with appropriate kinds of control and interpretation and becomes immediately a resource of benefit to the sick patient.

The function of the university as a communication device is really an interesting one to analyze. I think one can say that teaching involves communication, without any question, but when one considers teaching beyond the primary responsibility of instructors, the student who goes on in a formal academic setting, the university itself, can be regarded as having a communications and interpretive function of simply moving ideas out to the community. I think that this is a real and specific responsibility of universities today.

I think the utilization of library resources can be made extremely effective in terms of teaching at any level, in terms of supplementing post-graduate education. It certainly is feasible to program the resources of our library of medical sciences into teaching community hospitals in New Mexico on a direct basis. Our cataloguing system is all on IBM and it's all systematized, so presumably a physician who had a problem in Las Cruces could have a direct line and direct feed-back from the library in relation to the problem. Very shortly thereafter he could tie this problem and the information he had received concerning it into one of the teaching programs that emanate from the university, or to any of four hospitals in Albuquerque which will all plug into this centralized system.

This is the scope of the problem. The administration of any institution tends to be underestimated in terms of the amount of time and energy which the administration takes. I might just put in one plug for a particular view that

I have about administration. Whether it is centralized or not, it must take place for anything to function. If there is an inadequate central administration, then administration goes on in peripheral areas and people who are not supposed to be are utilizing large amounts of time in administration instead of being effective in teaching, research, or some other function. Large amounts of their time are absorbed in administrative functions. If they are not professional administrators, it simply confuses the primary duties they are supposed to be discharging. I think this tends to happen in many educational environments; the central administration has not sufficient numbers to solve the administrative problems in the more difficult elements of the system, so that a great deal of time is wasted of people who may be very effective teachers, in just simple administrative tasks. I would hope, in terms of medicine at any rate, that this problem will be solved so that the time of people in practice, or teaching medical students to take care of patients, or doing research, could be protected. They should do what they were really qualified and trained to do best, and not have to waste a good bit of their years doing these administrative things which can be simplified.

CHAPTER V

THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A RESIDENCE EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

Simon Herman

I am here to talk about a program that was developed back in 1958 and has been running for about eight years. It is called the Southwest Management Program and is designed primarily for individuals in the industrial management and business fields. The sponsors for this program were originally Dr. Howard Finston of the College of Business Administration and myself. We had the original contract for this particular program as consultants to the Atomic Energy Commission. In our discussion with the Atomic Energy Commission, we found that it was having problems of a managerial nature which, after some preliminary discussion with the group, appeared to stem from the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission had grown very rapidly, and that many people in other government services had requested transfer into the managerial structure of the AEC.

This created some problems as the organization grew and became much more complex, so Dr. Finston and I decided we'd best find out what needs the organization had. In order to do this we went into what we came to call the depth-interviewing procedure. We interviewed the top administrative structure of the Atomic Energy Commission, some middle management people, and then went into the central personnel office and asked them what kinds of problems they were receiving from their field offices. What kind of problems were they asked to solve or help solve? Taking our cue from this we began by providing a rough pilot program for the Atomic Energy Commission. The Albuquerque Operations Office, incidentally, administered the whole program. This office, if I understand correctly, extends from the Bikini Islands to Clearwater, Florida.

Basically, the objectives of our program were: (1) to provide the conferees with information on new developments in the management field, (2) to acquaint the conferees with methods and techniques they could use in dealing with work problem situations, (3) to reaffirm and augment their particular knowledge of the principles underlying effective administration, (4) to broaden the management perspective of the participating executives by exposure to a behaviorial science approach in analysis of administrative problems, (5) to develop in them a greater appreciation of their fellow men and thereby to achieve greater understanding of man's problems and greater capacity to deal with people, (6) to acquire knowledge and information that may be extended to non-participating supervisors through on-the-job training, and (7) to encourage individual analysis and discussion of personalized work problem situations.

In order to accomplish these objectives, we set up four areas of contact. The first was managerial economics, even though we were dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission and no one was giving them competition, except maybe the Russians. We felt that a more global approach to economics would influence and help the manager understand better his role, and the AEC's role in the total economy of the country and even of the world. The second content area dealt with the behavioral science applications to management techniques. We were concerned not only with the psychological approach, but also the sociological and anthropological approaches to industrial problems. The third idea with which we were very much concerned, since the work of the operation depended upon it, was that of communications. We instituted a portion of the program which included the communication process and a better understanding of that process. The fourth area, a cognitive area, concerned itself with human relations in organizational behavioral patterns.

We wanted to present a philosphy of training. The first thing we tried to get across to the organization was that training was not a one-time activity; that training, if it were to be effective, must consist of continuous training activities. Implicit in the term training appears to be a need for a change in behavior. Philosophically we felt that changes should not occur only over the period of the program but should have some lasting qualities. That is, we weren't looking for transient changes in the behaviors of the individuals but for a more lasting type of behavior.

We felt that behavior does not occur, in isolation, in a vacuum, but in interactions with other people. The organization proceeds on the basis of interpersonal relationships, so we felt that the training should start at the top of the organization in order to develop there the kind of social climate which is necessary for continuing the growth of the individual; for his development as well as for maintaining whatever changes might occur in a very brief week-long program. We encountered some opposition to this particular request because the top of the organization thought that the training should best occur at the middle. "This was a fine program for the boys beneath us but not for me." With great misgivings, which we communicated to the organization, we did start in the middle of the organization and agreed to run three pilot groups. After the three pilot groups were completed, we designed an evaluation sheet and requested the individuals to evaluate the program in terms of content, its value to them individually, the kinds of instructions that they found of little value, and the situation itself.

Almost to a man, the participants responded by sending this open-ended question back to us -- "This is fine, but I can't apply the techniques if my boss doesn't understand them. Why don't you start with my boss?" We went back to the Atomic Energy Commission with this comment, feeling righteous and correct in this whole process. We were backed by some good research in this area, the Fleishman study at International Harvester, for example. Its major contribution was its pointing out that unless the individual's superiors believed in the particular changes that we and the training programs were trying to bring about, the individuals would have a negative reaction instead of becoming more human-relations conscious. In this particular program, for instance, they became more boss-centered.

So, we went back to the Atomic Energy Commission with our proposal to work with the top structure and this time they agreed, sending in the top structure of the Albuquerque operations. We received evaluations of the program from these three groups (top, middle and lower levels) and modified our program slightly to accommodate the particular comments that they had made. I think that, for me at least, this procedure is almost axiomatic if one is going to create the kind of social climate that is necessary for an effective democratic type of administration. We are biased toward this type of administration because we do live in a democratic society and the democratic processes within the society have great value in the development of the individual.

Working with our bias, we tried to develop a democratic outlook in our people. The social plans which we were trying to instill, and of which the AEC was quite aware, concerned development of a democratic process and decentralization. By this we meant helping to bring the decision-making level down the line. Don't misinterpret what I'm saying. By bringing the decision-making level down the line, we were not saying that the top structure in the AEC should go down to the line operator and say, "Shall we continue testing or not?" This is not within the scope of the confidence of the individual on the line, but there are certain areas that would be within his scope, and if we could bring these down the line we could help prepare the individual to accept greater and greater responsibility.

We were next faced with trying to develop this program and we decided on a retreat-type program. Why a retreat? By a retreat-type program, I mean a program which is away from the home office, generally in a fairly nice vacation resort area, in which the individuals are forced to live together for the duration of the program.

We were influenced in this by a statement of one of my professors, Bill Wrights at Wayne State University, who used to talk in terms of how we educate, how we train. The first method he talked about was the "conking" method. The conking method is where we hit the child on the head and force him to learn. We say, "Now you will learn (conk, conk) and if you don't you will get punished." He thought this method was fairly ineffective. He characterized the next method of teaching as a "process of words." This was a little bit better but not quite as good as the third, which he considered to be "play." He then moved from "play" to "social kinds of activity" and his last concept of how we learn, the most effective in his opinion, was by "celebration." This enabled us to build in our own success factor. If we send individuals, or if our organizations would send individuals to a retreat-type program, a nice resort area, where they had good food, drink, and conversation, when we asked them what they thought about our program, we knew what the answer had to be. "Great!" How could you argue against that particular concept?

In all seriousness I think a retreat has many advantages. One of the great advantages, for example, is that it removes the individual from the immediate work area so that interruptions are at a minimum. I would like to say that they are totally removed, that we just don't see them at all, but I can't. We did find in the first group of top-structure people that they were getting a great many long-distance telephone calls, but the group began to put social pressure on these individuals who were constantly getting these calls and asked them very embarrassing question like, "You sure have decentralized your operation, haven't you? As soon as you leave, it falls apart."

In a sense this brings out the other advantage of the conference-retreat program, because it does say that social pressures can modify behavior to a greater extent than I can with a lecture method or by putting pressures on an individual to modify his behavior. I think we are all familiar with this idea from working with our own teenagers. The amount of pressure we put on them doesn't make any difference, because it is the group pressure for them to conform to certain styles, the way they wear their hair, the clothes they wear, the music they listen to, that is significant for them. All the pressures I put on them individually are relatively ineffective compared to the social pressures that exist with the group. Another advantage, then, is that there develops in the group social pressure to change and this social pressure has a tendency to reduce the amount of resistance that the individual has for change.

Another reason for a retreat is that people are away from home, they don't have the comfort of old friendships and relationships, and are forced into forming new ones. In this process, they have breakfast, lunch, and dinner together, they drink or play poker together at night and get about 18 hours of togetherness a day. That's an awful lot.

A fourth advantage, we found, was that interpersonal relationships caused the group to become much more cohesive, and in becoming more cohesive it developed a group personality. Each group (and this has been our experience through 40 or 50) is different, behaves differently, and has its own personality. We remember the participants perhaps not as individuals but as a group. Incidentally, at the end of our program, the conferees will say, when we ask for some feedback material from them, "Did you ever see a group like ours before?" They always do this; they are beginning to think in terms of group behavior. These are the reasons why we selected a retreat-type program.

What about the training itself? This we felt should be trainee-centered, not instructor-centered or conference leader-centered. In order to bring this about we always vigorously seek a great deal of participation on the part of each individual trainee. He learns to contribute. I do not set up my session as an expert in human relations or in understanding human behavior, since I feel that many of the individuals in the group are experts in their own right. My job is perhaps to help them formalize some of this very informal knowledge that they have concerning human behavior. In selecting conference leaders for the program, we operated more on the basis of personality than on the basis of technical competence. I think that we did get a great deal of technical competence built into the program, but I also feel that we were more concerned with the personality of the individual than with technical background.

We are very much concerned about participation because we have research evidence to prove that the more emotional involvement we can get on the part of the individual the less he will resist the forces for change in our program. So we tell them all we are not experts; we want them to participate. What we are trying to do is bring a "group think" to bear on any particular problem that we have.

Another thing that we built into the program was a flexibility of approach. We are not generally concerned with how much content we get across, so we try to work as effectively as we can at the speed at which the individual trainees can go. This isn't always possible, though we give it a lot of lip service in education. At the end of the third grade we have to get to the fourth grade and we have to do fourth grade work. We have a little different situation in the sense that whatever they pick up in our "shotgun" training approach, we feel will have some value to them. To the extent that they can make this a part of their own behaviorial processes we have been successful. With some individuals we get a great deal of change; with others we get little, if any. But, we can also justify these programs on the basis that any exposure to education must be good in itself.

We have to be very much concerned with a strong communication process between individuals, and between the individual conference leaders. We have to make an assessment very quickly as to what the level of the group is, since by their vitae we can't really tell. We try to do this as quickly as possible and then move as flexibly as we can with the group's training in the particular content. At times I have been able to get through a great deal of material; at other times very little. I still feel that we are moving at the rate at which the trainees can move and this is the only rate at which

I think is feasible to work.

What this has meant then, is that on a Wednesday night I will call the individual who had the Wednesday session and ask how things went that day, and he will give me his assessment of the group. On Thursday night I will call the individual who had the Thursday night session and ask him how things went and he will give me his assessment. By Friday morning, the time that I am to go on, I feel that I have at least a little bit of feeling for the group. I test this hypothesis in terms of my material and generally we think the three of us have been together. I don't believe we have been together because I have already set the proceedings in a certain way, because one of the strong comments that we get is that we seem to be able to move with the group.

Since all business and industry, all activity, must involve people, I have been somewhat concerned about the basic attitude that I seem to find in industrial relations. There seems to be a belief that : (1) fear motivation is very sound, (2) blaming someone is a good method for correcting some particular kind of action, (3) people want to get as much as possible for as little output as possible, and (4) kindness and understanding and thinking of the dignity of an individual is a great sign of weakness.

I suppose maybe that what I am looking for in my particular kind of sessions consists of something like this: (1) attitudinal changes such as respect for people as people, (2) understanding that all behavior is caused, it doesn't happen willy-nilly, (3) understanding that all people have needs which are not just exactly like my own, (4) an ability to describe human behavior in non-value terms, (5) an understanding that all people differ, and (6) an understanding that all healthy people want to be members of a society and to do an acceptable job. In a sense, they have a need to accomplish, a need for recognition, and they want to behave in a manner such as this, in order to satisfy those needs.

Another decision in the program involved giving up the lecture, and moving to a great deal of discussion-type material. Yes, I know how to give a lecture, but I don't feel that this is most effective. As soon as I walk into a group, there is generally a feeling of "O.K. start talking, I'll start writing." I try to explain to them that if we happen to drop any pearls of wisdom in the next eight hours, we'll all stop and take notes. What we really want to do is discuss and have them bring their experience to bear on a particular kind of problem.

A second decision was the use of case studies. We use two kinds of case studies. We use the canned approach in which I think there is some value. I prefer, however, a more dynamic approach. We, in our letter to the participants two weeks prior to their coming, ask them to develop a case themselves. It might not be the best case in the world, but it's an on-going problem, a real problem, and unlike the canned approach with a canned solution, we can come up with a real problem and a real solution. Some people like it and some people don't. We have about a 50-50 reaction.

We have used one other technique: we use a role-play situation after using discussion and case study. In using role-playing, we first discuss role-playing; how they are going to get involved in a situation. I have actually tried tape recording and playbacks. We go through the role-playing to set up an interview situation in which the individual must solve or move toward a solution of a problem and then play the tape back and have the individual hear himself in this process. Then we talk in terms of non-verbal kinds of communication as opposed to the verbal and the individuals in the group will say, "You not only said that but you should have seen how you looked when you said it."

These are the things that we have done. The program, we feel, has been fairly successful. We have gone through over 500 people and through the insistence of the people who have gone through the program, we have now set up and run the first pilot advanced course, the only prerequisite being that they have attended the first course. We have taken people that have had training as far back as our first group seven or eight years ago, as well as people who just went through the program a year ago. From one of the feedback sessions that we had on the advance program we got some feeling that there should be a third program. We do not treat the trainee as a student; we treat him as a contributing member of the group.

CHAPTER VI

MODELS FOR CHANGE IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS: REINFORCEMENT

Robert J. Berger

In the application of any theory or model to a particular area, there are a number of assumptions which must be made. While the assumptions themselves may be open to attack or criticism, the failure to consider them at all, or to make them explicit, permits widespread misuse and misinterpretation of the model. It would indeed be unfortunate if a model, suitable for specific applications, were to be rejected for failure to state the limitations. One may accept or reject the applicability of a model on its own, with or without stated assumptions, but to the extent that the limitations are made explicit, the model has potential utility for a particular set of circumstances. Thus, it seems obvious that the utility of a model for learning to fly would ultimately depend on whether the given conditions included a plane, a mock-up, or a "Link-trainer."

The first assumption or condition required for utilization of the Reinforcement Model is that one can identify and describe the criterion behavior which is desired. That is, if one wishes to alter or modify the behavior of a school administrator or other personnel in a school system, it is essential to be able to state this criterion in terms of observable behavior, and to state the specific conditions which are to govern this behavior. While this may appear to be unduly restrictive and narrow for the rather gross kinds of changes often desired, the principles of the Reinforcement Model are absolutely contingent upon this degree of specificity. Moreover, there are a number of justifications for this limitation, the foremost of which is that the requirement allows for the empirical validation of the model. If this assumption is met, and if the model is applied, it is possible to test the effectiveness of the procedures employed by observing the occurence and the frequency of the criterion behavior.

The second assumption is closely related to the first, and states that the new response which is sought must serve as a discriminative stimulus to mediate suitable outcomes in the school system. Perhaps an illustration can best serve to clarify this point. Suppose for the moment that there is a high positive correlation between the scores of teachers on a teacher attitude inventory and the general achievement level of their pupils. This situation merely describes a response-response, an R-R, relationship which is descriptive and correlational in nature. It does not permit any inferences of a causal relationship which suggest what can be done to increase pupil achievement. The very fact that a model for change is to be considered here suggests that functional relationships which permit inferences of causality are of primary interest. What is desired, then, is an S-R relationship which states that a specific response is a function of a particular stimulus situation (S = (f) R). For example, if pupil achievement is a function of a particular type of teacher behavior, then this particular behavior of the teacher serves as a discriminative stimulus to mediate pupil achievement. The administrator is one step removed, and now the problem is one of finding functional relationships which demonstrate that what the administrator does, serves as a discriminative stimulus to mediate the desired teacher behavior. If administrative behavior does not serve as a discriminative stimulus to mediate the appropriate teacher behavior, and if the teacher behavior does not serve as a discriminative stimulus to mediate greater gains or efficiency in pupil achievement, or some other equally valid consequence, one ought to question the purpose of widespread change.

The final assumption is that there are a number of practicing professionals in school systems who are not presently making the response which is desired. It is assumed that there are potential consumers, or users, of a model for change. While this assumption may find little opposition here, as perceptions of those in the field vary, it may relate to potential difficulties in the application of the model.

The purpose of this paper is not to comment on the validity of the foregoing assumptions or whether they have been met, nor is it to attempt the specification of the behavioral changes which may be appropriate. This is the function of those persons who occupy positions of leadership for the planning of programs, either pre-service or in-service. The purpose is rather to suggest how certain functional relationships, derived from experimental studies in psychology, can be related to behavioral changes in school systems. The focus will, therefore, be on principles of behavior and their application to school systems.

The major principle of instrumental conditioning may be stated simply, "responses followed by a reinforcer are strengthened." This is to say that those behaviors which are followed by satisfying or rewarding consequences have a greater likelihood of being repeated, or occurring again in like or similar situations. A response which has been reinforced has a greater probability of occurrence than it had prior to its reinforcement. Although the principle as stated suggests oversimplification, the problems to be encountered in managing a contingency in such a way that appropriate responses are reinforced while undesirable responses are not, should counterbalance the tendency to oversimplify.

The first problem posed by this principle is that of getting the new or desired response to occur. If the response is completely new to a person and not a part of his response repertoire, "shaping" procedures would be employed. This means that any initial attempt to make the response would be reinforced, while thereafter only closer approximations of the desired response would result in a reinforcement. The procedures of "successive approximation" would be utilized until the new response is mastered and becomes a part of his response repertoire.

While there may be circumstances in which one would be dealing with a completely new response, this is not normally the case. Typically, the person is already capable of making the response and the problem is one of getting it to occur more frequently. In this instance the procedure consists of arranging a stimulus situation for the response, cueing it sufficiently, and applying a reinforcer when it does occur. Included in this strategy should be an analysis of those responses which compete with the desired response. As a result of such an analysis it may be necessary to extinguish certain behavior by not reinforcing it when it occurs.

The second problem in the utilization of reinforcement centers around the conditions which are to govern the occurrence of the desired response. It would be highly unlikely that a suitable change in behavior would include merely the repeating of a response, indiscriminately. Usually one wishes to specify when the response is appropriate by stating the particular stimulus situation in which the response should occur. From the point of view of the learner there are two tasks, learning to make the response, and learning when to make the response. The latter task is called discrimination learning, and is achieved by differentially dispensing the reinforcement. Responses are reinforced if made in the presence of the correct condition, which is usually referred to as the discriminative stimulus, or the S^D. Responses are not reinforced if made in the presence of other stimulus conditions. These "other stimulus conditions" which are potentially confusable to the learner are typically referred to as S deltas. If, for example, the issuance of a directive to the staff is an appropriate administrative response to make in situation A, but not in situation B, then situation A is the discriminative stimulus, the S^D, and responses made when this condition is present should be reinforced. However, situation B is an example of an S delta, and responses made in the presence of this condition should not be reinforced. By presenting a variety of stimulus situations during the training period and only reinforcing responses made in the presence of the S^D, the learner will form the discrimination. Bear in mind that the manager of this learning situation must be able to specify the discriminative stimulus. If he is unable to do so, he cannot differentially reinforce the responses, and no discrimination learning can occur.

The problem just described is essentially that of attaining stimulus control. The principle of generalization states that if a response is reinforced in the presence of situation A there will be a greater tendency to make this response in related situations. The degree of similarity of related situations will determine the slope of the generalization gradient. To counteract the tendency to make the response in a variety of circumstances, and to have the response come under the control of the discriminative stimulus so that whenever that stimulus is present the response is made, it is necessary to utilize differential reinforcement procedures, that is, to provide discrimination training. This makes it possible to insure a high probability of responding to the S^D and to reduce the probability of responding to an S delta to a zero, or near zero, value.

The third problem presented by the model is that of defining the reinforcing event. Reinforcement may be defined as an increase in the future probability or rate of a particular response as a result of the immediate delivery of a stimulus contingent upon that response. This type of definition is functional in content and is usually preferred over a subjective definition. A subjective definition would probably state that the reinforcer was rewarding or pleasant. Since these are subjective terms or states this definition is less satisfactory. Procedural definitions, on the other hand, specify the exact type and amount of stimulus presented. Since different specific procedures may be used to produce similar effects, the class of events included in the first, the functional definition, can be quite broad. The functional definition has the further advantage of being general while still making it possible to identify reinforcement whenever the stimulus, response, immediate delivery, and probability can be identified. While a functional definition describes a causal relationship, it does not describe or explain the underlying process. The more obvious limitation of this definition is that there is no certain, "a priori" knowledge of whether any event is able to reinforce a response. Some persons have further suggested that when one considers the magnitude of individual differences it becomes meaningless and circular to talk about reinforcement at all as a useful concept. The two redeeming features of the concept of reinforcement are found in the fact that one can always put the stimulus to an empirical test and determine whether it has the power to reinforce a response, and, secondly, human beings are more similar than dissimilar, individual differences notwithstanding.

There are a number of events which appear to have nearly universal power to reinforce human behavior. This is particularly true if the context is limited to professional school personnel. The multiplicity of groups and organizations for educators of all types, and at all levels, attests to our insatiable desire or need for recognition and approval. No attempt will be made to enumerate the organizations, nor the frequency with which we assemble to bestow honors and recognition on each other. Indeed, the only reinforcement available for much of our behavior is the opportunity to present papers at our various gatherings. (No immediate or personal application is intended.) In addition to recognition and approval one could list titles, merit pay, and position advancements as potential reinforcers for which we often appear to be in a continual state of deprivation. The problem is not one of a lack of reinforcing events with nearly universal appeal.

Another aspect of reinforcement is the person or agent who dispenses the reinforcer. Data available suggests that some persons are more effective as reinforcing agents than others. Social power, which is often related to this phenomenon, is frequently defined as the ability of a person to influence the behavior of others by controlling or mediating their positive and negative reinforcement.

Studies of imitative behavior suggest that the frequency with which people pattern their behavior after another is a function of the number of reinforcers he has to dispense. In one study, (Bandura, 1962) children more frequently imitated the behavior of one adult who had a bag of reinforcers, than that of another adult who did not hold reinforcers. This was true in spite of the fact that no reinforcers were actually acquired by the children.

This implies that administrators have some social power merely because they hold potential reinforcers for school personnel. The extent of this authority relation is a function of the amount and variety of reinforcers he has at his disposal. The behavior of a person with social power becomes a discriminative stimulus for other people and mediates imitating responses.

But an administrator, or any leader, is not interested merely in imitative behavior. Indeed, this may be the least appropriate response of all possible. Typically the leader wishes the group, or some of its members, to follow his verbal directives. Dollard and Miller have noted that if following of one person's verbal advice is consistently rewarding, while following the advice of others is not, a discrimination will be formed and people will seek and follow the advice of the first person.

There are two ways in which reinforcement is possible for following the verbal statements of another. First, the leader who issued the advice or command may award approval to those who carry out his order, or he may remove some aversive stimuli when the order is carried out. This is an immediate reinforcement, but requires the leader to be present. Many verbal commands would never result in action unless the leader were actually present to dispense positive and negative reinforcement. The second way in which following behavior can be reinforced is when the behavior mediated by the advice results in rewarding consequences. If, for example, a teacher is having difficulty in threading a projector and someone offers advice which mediates behavior which results in a successful completion of the task, the teacher was rewarded for following the verbal suggestion.

The second method offers more risk than the first, since each time advice is given you open up the possibility of losing influence if the results of following are not reinforced. Many studies in social psychology are related to these principles although the terminology is somewhat different. But the results indicate that the social power of a person to influence following behavior by others is, in part, a function of his ability to make verbal statements which mediate behavior that is reinforced. Thus, an administrator whose advice leads others to a successful solution of their problems has enhanced his social power and prestige. He is now a more effective reinforcing agent, and his verbal statements become discriminative stimuli for following behavior.

This is exactly the way we learn to "trust" certain people and not others. If one's verbal behavior corresponds to his overt behavior we are reinforced for accepting his verbal statement. If one says, "I will not betray your confidence," and his overt behavior is such that he does not, we are reinforced for taking him at his word.

As you may have noted, the reinforcement in this type of situation does not occur immediately, there may be considerable delay between revealing a confidence and the ultimate determination that it has not been betrayed. The same is true of following the advice of another. While it is frequently easy to explain this in terms of "chaining", that is, a sequence of stimulus and response relationships which are all strengthened by the ultimate reinforcer, it is also apparent that humans can tolerate greater delay between a response and the reinforcement than can infra-human organisms.

There are two more points which require comment before moving to the next topic. One of these is the matter of the reinforcement schedule. Research demonstrates that when a response is being learned it is most efficient if each appropriate response is reinforced. It is not necessary, however, to provide continuous reinforcement to maintain the response. Occasional reinforcement is not only more practical, but also a more efficient way of maintaining a conditioned response. The second point is that, hopefully, one can arrive at the point where he provides his own reinforcement for the conditioned behavior. In every-day life it may be noted that behavior which was originally reported as "hard work" may, after a period of being reinforced, be reported as being "pleasant." This may be considered in terms of a response-produced stimulus, or in more common terms, "he enjoys his work." Regardless of the terminology, such a state of affairs is obviously the most desirable for there is no longer a need for a reinforcer to be applied by some external agent.

To this point a number of instrumental conditioning principles have been described which were derived from a rather sterile set of circumstances. Experimental research has indeed demonstrated the principles outlined, but typically in a controlled setting where stimulus control was relatively easily attained due to the restrictive environment, the limited number of response alternatives, and the few reinforcers available. While there is nothing at present to indicate that the principles will not hold true for any type of application, it would be sheer folly to disregard some essential differences between the two situations.

The major discrepancy between the laboratory and applied setting does not lie in the type or content of problems dealt with, but with the number of concurrent contingencies operating at any given time. This introduces complexity into the analysis of competing responses and implies greater availability of reinforcers. While the first problem, that of competing responses, can be dealt with by not reinforcing or punishing those behaviors which interfere with the desired behavior, the second problem is more severe. If the agents for change do not hold a majority of the reinforcers controlling the behavior of others, then their position is materially weakened and the other reinforcing agents, be they other teachers, parents, or pupils, are in a position to maintain the present ongoing behaviors. Hopefully, such is not the case. It would seem that those who make decisions regarding pay increases and advancement are in the favored position unless their behavior is mediated by the verbal behavior of these other groups.

In order to draw some of the aspects of the model together it may be well to present a hypothetical situation and attempt a verbal application. Assume for the moment that we are planning an in-service training program for high school principals. Before establishing any type of program, our task is to describe the responses which these principals are to make following the program which they do not make at present. Secondly, we want to be able to state that these new responses are functionally related to greater pupil gain, or some other valid goal. To simplify the task it will be necessary to take certain liberties with present knowledge and merely state some given conditions which are hypothetical. Our purpose for the in-service program is to increase the response of hiring teachers who have had a particular and specified type of training. Furthermore, teachers who have had this training prepare lessons in a way that facilitates greater pupil gain, while teachers with other types of training are far less likely to prepare their lessons in this fashion. Thus, we have specified the new response and related it functionally to pupil gain. Admittedly, this is easy when you do not need to supply empirical evidence for your functional relationships.

Now that the assumptions of the model have been met we can review the principles of the reinforcement model. We want to alter the behavior of our high school principals so as to increase the probability of their hiring teachers with a specified type of training. Since the hiring of teachers is not a new response for them we can by-pass the "shaping" procedures of successive approximation.

It would be possible to condition this desired response "on the job", but by providing training sessions we can hasten the process and avoid the necessity of having a reinforcing agent at the principals side when he hires a new teacher. Furthermore, training sessions provide the opportunity to make a larger number of responses in a relatively brief period of time when they do not, in fact, count. We can arrange for many responses without flooding a school with newly acquired teachers, and reinforce these responses with greater ease.

The task for the principal is not to acquire a new response but to learn to discriminate the conditions in which his response will be reinforced. To go back to the terminology of discrimination training, the hiring response will be reinforced when made in the presence of the S^D, the specified training of the teacher. Any other type of teacher training is an S delta. Our strategy would be to present the principal with a variety of teacher applications, the stimulus for hiring responses, and ask him to respond by indicating on each application if he would hire the person. As he responds the instructor would differentially reinforce his responses. After a period of training the hiring response will come under the control of the S^D, the appropriate type of teacher preparation.

For reinforcers we could use verbal approval, and the most appropriate dispenser of this approval would be a person who had some social power, such as his superintendent. During the training each correct response would be reinforced until he formed the discrimination, after which it would be on an intermittent schedule.

Once the response is learned we have the problem of maintaining it. Eventually we hope the response will be "self-reinforcing" but until that time it would be well for the superintendent to occassionally review the principal's hiring responses and reinforce him for hiring in the presence of the S^D.

Competing responses are not a problem in this instance since he must hire teachers. However, it is possible he may be reinforced by teachers, parents, or pupils for hiring teachers of another type. These agents would most assuredly be more effective than a distant professor in some university. By using the local superintendent it seems likely that we may avoid this problem as well, since he holds more powerful stimuli for positive or negative reinforcement than those employed by him or those with only occassional contacts.

Although the application was hypothetical, verbal, and simple, it is hoped that it served as a summary of the concepts of reinforcement. The limitations imposed by time were not as severe as those imposed by my limited knowledge of functional relationships between administrative behavior and its effect as an S^D to mediate improved teacher or pupil behavior. Where these relationships are available I see great potential for the utility of the reinforcement model, where there is a void of functional relationships I see a great need for empirical research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bandura, A. Social learning through imitation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln, Univ. Nebraska Press, 1962.

Dollard, J. and Miller, N. Personality and psychotherapy. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Skinner, B. Operant Behavior. In W. K. Honig (Ed.), Operant behavior: areas of research and application. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Staats, A. and Staats, C. Complex human behavior. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

CHAPTER VII

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT

Robert Utter

To address a group of specialists in administrative training is like carrying coals to Newcastle; however, our experience might be of interest as a case study of the program of a changing institution.

A salient feature of school systems is their extremely flat structure. A school board, a superintendent and some principals constitute all of the layers. By contrast, I come from a large bureaucratic structure organized in a classic textbook fashion with six or seven layers of management and a much higher degree of administrative specialization. Let me describe Sandia to you to set a background for describing some of our training activity.

Sandia Corporation is an offspring of Los Alamos from the early days of the development of atomic weapons. The Los Alamos Laboratory is run for the government by the University of California and is staffed by scientists and engineers. At Sandia there was much ordnance engineering and production to be handled. After several years the University requested that the AEC find an industrial firm to take over the Sandia Operation and the government asked Western Electric of Bell Telephone Laboratories to assume direction on a non-profit basis.

Sandia now employs roughly 8000 people, most of them in Albuquerque. Almost a thousand of the staff have doctorates and M.S. degrees. Another 1700 are college graduates. There are numbers of highly trained technicians and fewer than a thousand employees with less than a high school education.

We show a broad educational spectrum heavily weighted at the top with the operation being more in R and D than production.

Sandia has one unique administrative distinction in that it has four sets of auditors. Most organizations have to struggle along with one, or at most two, but we are quadruply blessed. Although we are government funded, Sandia is a private concern.

To briefly describe our management structure some numbers are useful. The non-resident board of directors meets in Albuquerque, although its members are from the parent companies. The president of Sandia has under him nine vice-presidents who in turn have 30 directors reporting to them. Below this level are about 100 departments and over 400 divisions. There is one more lower level in the non-technical divisions. About a year ago we dropped one level of supervision, a move which created some interesting problems.

The initial choice of supervisors was based on ability to get the job done so that most were selected for technical expertise, not formal training in administration. In general most of the middle and upper management ranks were filled by former project engineers, and this naturally created a wide variety of styles of management. As the laboratory matured and the rapid growth slowed down, then, some attention could be paid to management development courses.

When training was started in the mid-fifties it was begun at middle management levels and then shifted downwards. The first major effort was an intensive two-week course for managers in human relations in supervision. From this beginning sub-skills were identified and courses laid out to cover such topics as "talking with people, coordinating operations, counseling employees, communication techniques, and selection of employees." The purpose was to provide formal training in supervisory skills.

In course development various sources have been used. There has been some use of outside consultants, some borrowing from A.T. and T. and Western Electric and a healthy share of in-house development.

At lower levels of supervision we began with survey conferences which included such topics as supervisory duties and responsibilities, staff service procedures, and supervisory skills. They worked problems, exchanged ideas, engaged in role-playing and other techniques popular at the time. As an aside, at the national level now everyone is putting things into grids and becoming sensitized. One would hope these fads will pass.

As one example of a very specific training need, one can see in a large organization the importance of effective conducting of operational meetings. Where much time is spent in technical, administrative, planning, and purchasing conferences one can substantially increase efficiency by providing appropriate training. It is also seen by supervision as being job relevant. Similarly, there were specific needs to acquaint supervisors with company policy in such matters as wages and salaries, labor relations, budget planning and job evaluation and classification. This constituted a second phase of training.

In the third phase we began to develop a series of courses aimed at advanced management practices. Some of the course names were "Developing Individual and Group Effectiveness," "Motivation-Communication Workshop," and "Department Manager Seminars." These initial workshops were planned at locations away from the job to obtain undivided attention from participants and protect them from job pressure.

We are moving into a fourth phase of very specific kinds of courses. Middle management is well oriented with respect to general corporation philosophy and now we are concentrating on operating problems. What appears to be useful is a very detailed kind of training in the special problems that managers have. Some of the press for human relations training arose from a limited perception of managerial problems. It sounds rational to say, "He operates through people; therefore if he knows people better he will operate better." However, one can also say, "This manager is a problem solver and if he can better define his problems he will perform more effectively regardless of his orientation toward people." Following this reasoning, one of our current programs is directed toward helping those people who have special purchasing problems handle that part of their job. Similarly, we have directed attention to plant maintenance and engineering. One of the things we are investigating is the generation of courses in operations research techniques for management. So far we can't report success. We're still trying and will continue to work at it, but the problem turns out to be complicated. We thought at first we could simply provide basic training in the fundamental tools of operations research, such as the use of mathematical models, problem definition, definition of constraints, and the mathematical and computer techniques necessary to run the models. It turns out that in general the problems are too complicated. We don't have enough operations research specialists to determine whether or not the problems are solvable.

Parenthetically, let me say that most problems you see in the literature have to do with things like warehouse allocation, transportation problems, and waiting problems. If you are considering teaching operations research methods to administrators, I would strongly recommend that you take a good look at what the airlines have done. They do have a success story.

The example I meant to give you was this. The management of our guard force asked a skilled OR man to schedule the guards. The task is to arrange an equitable schedule that rotates people over three shifts for seven days a week with appropriate days off. One of the principal constraints is seniority, but there are others. Even with a relatively small group, to handle the mathematical and model turned out to be so complex that the problem was classed as unsuitable for OR methods. We are told by experts that this is not particularly unusual. They can't build a workable mathematical model that also takes into account vacation schedules and the skills of the people. So here's a job of scheduling that is too complicated for our computers to justify the machine time.

It happens in the operations research business that you can get all carried away talking about how they used PERT on the Polaris program and managed marvelously an incredibly complicated development program, but it was, unfortunately, a very special case.

Some of the new kinds of activities we are undertaking offer some interesting management challenges. One of the more interesting of these new projects has to do with the aero-space non-contamination experiments. We are working with Jet Propulsion Laboratory of Cal Tech, NASA, and others. How can humans assemble anything that doesn't contain some biological contamination? It's an interesting problem to think about. One's first impulse is to boil it, radiate it, or something, but practically all the materials you'd like to be able to use in sensitive scientific equipment when subjected to these environments will no longer operate. One of the most important single aspects of this problem is that of developing appropriate mathematical models of the problem before starting physical testing. We have a new team assembled to see if they can come up with some answers.

We can use this and other projects to illustrate a problem. We have managers who are out of touch with the people who work for them. I am sure that you have this problem in educational administration. Educational administrators, if they have been out of school long enough, can no longer talk to the new grads. This is one place where, in spite of the fact that usually we hear about how difficult the behavioral sciences are as compared with the physical sciences, you are much better off because people are pretty much the same. Physical science is changing rapidly. People, in fact, change infuriatingly slowly, as you see when you attempt to make changes in societal patterns, roles, and attitudes.

In response to this class of problems we have organized special programs designed to technically update our supervision. Our most ambitious effort to date is modeled on a University of California at Los Angeles course prepared for the General Electric Company. Our course is called the Unified Science and Engineering Program. It features six weeks of very intensive training in physical science, advanced mathematics, and some materials engineering. An intensive exposure to modern science will, we hope, get a manager started on a reading program so that he will be able to keep up with what's going on in his scientific and technical field.

This kind of training for administrators seems to have a good pay-off. We have gone through the fourth group and about 100 people have completed the course. The criteria for selection are that they have been out of school a minimum of five years beyond their last degree, and that they have been chosen by their management. Such a program must have top management approval to succeed. We have an outstanding faculty teaching the course, and every effort is made to provide enrichment materials to supplement the presentations. It is still too early to evaluate its success, but we are optimistic. We would like to have it put on video-tape and have a six-week modern science training program that could possibly be released to national education television but so far that hasn't been possible.

The Sandia computer course for managers represents another effort to update supervision. Administrators must be able to handle the output of computers if they are going to be able to do their jobs, especially in a large system. The philosophy generally accepted today is that one can't understand computers unless he has done some programming. Managers, who are not ever going to program again, so far as they know, go through a programming experience. Pedagogically, we would like to know whether or not it is possible to give a manager an effective understanding of computers without having him program. The program takes one week. Of this, the central core (three days) is devoted to software (the programming itself). Then we give the material on the limitations of computers. We are very fortunate in having numerical analysts on the staff to provide consultation about whether certain problems are well behaved for computer solution.

In your business, people are going to have to make decisions about computers, for instance the school superintendent. He probably will be the man in the community expected to know the most about it and make the decision about whether or not a school system ought to go to computers. This topic probably deserves more attention than it is getting now. Maybe a service that you people could perform is to organize a hard-nosed advisory committee to help the poor devil who is stuck with making a recommendation about whether he ought to get a computer, or at least tell him the names of three reputable manufacturers and let them knock each other's products so that he will get somewhat of an idea as to whether or not to go.

One of the things you've noticed that has been conspicuously absent in my discussion is a method for picking good administrators, for identifying them and for telling whether an administrator training program has done any good. We have criterion problems just as you have. Our biggest failure here has been that, like everybody else, we never have taken the University of Chicago very seriously and developed a taxonomy of objectives for administrators. We pay lip-service of course, but we don't have objective, behavioral criteria for what constitutes good administration.

In a few cases we have gotten some hard evidence of training effectiveness. For instance, we used to have a number of complaints from employees that their immediate supervisors were not talking to them about their progress. In response to this problem we organized courses to train people to have adequate progress discussions with their employees. They apparently learned this skill, because the incidence of complaints has gone down sharply. The message got across after we tackled a limited area with success.

In closing, I would like to commend to you the literature about the management of R and D institutions. A lot of careful thought has been given to kinds of things that you might find of value. Some companies have made first rate studies of what constitutes good administration. The Dupont Company is one of these. Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing similarly has sponsored a number of first-rate studies. Standard Oil of New Jersey has probably done more on supervisory selection in a sophisticated way, than anybody else, including the government. Lastly, don't pass up the opportunity to look at government publications. I hope our experience has had some relevance for your meeting.

CHAPTER VIII

PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN INFLUENCING CHANGE

Stanley W. Caplan

The direct application of psychological skills and knowledges to managerial problems has been much more widely accepted and utilized by industrial and military organizations than it has been by educational entities.

Perhaps educational administrators and their sometimes friends, the professors of educational administration, are indeed the epitome of instructional lag and conservatism that the critics brand them. Or perhaps the press of daily crises -- line budget items, militant teachers, PTA resolutions, and unruly kids -- has made all of us shy away from concepts that are admittedly exotic, long term, and poorly defined.

In any case, planning of in-service programs normally begins with decisions (What shall the content be? Who shall we ask to do it? How much time and how many coffee breaks will we need?), rather than with an examination of the nature of the particular process itself and/or study of the interrelated personalities who will be involved.

It is interesting that we talk so glibly about semantic barriers (I get quite a mind picture of that one), communications problems, need satisfactions, and defenses, and do so little about them (except to invite a speaker to yap at us on one of the topics, or "demonstrate" in some fashion, to which yapping or demonstrations we then set up passive, uninvolved, audience situations and expect meaningful outcomes to magically emerge).

My crystal ball is cloudy, and I have no rabbits to pull from a nonexistent top hat, but I would at least propose that we look at the problem from a slightly different viewpoint. Lets wonder together:

1. What is it we want to happen as a result of this particular inservice program? I would like us to be quite hardheaded and precise at this point: Let us have no patience with "I want my teachers to understand kids" or "I want the principals to get a feel for team teaching." Let us behavioristically define what outcomes we want to emerge and let us, before we go further, decide (first, not last) how we propose to measure (or, at least, know) if the outcomes we desire do, indeed, take place. For example, if sessions dealing with studying-kids have a simple-minded goal of reducing (or increasing) the numbers of kids sent to the office, we will at least be able to plan our attack upon the problem in a manner that just might relate to the terminal objective performances desired.
2. How can we, then, design a program, for these particular teachers or administrators, that will achieve our goals? Do we really want to "teach" content, or do we want to create a learning atmosphere conducive to change? If we should choose the former, a study of the process by which content is "sent" and "received" may help; if we choose the latter, we had better design a program that makes individuals aware of their own life- (or work-) style in such a way that they can release the potential found in the personalities (kids', teachers' or parents') with which they are to work.

It is my theoretical bias that either of these approaches can be accommodated within a yet-to-be-developed structure, or model, involving the following recognitions:

1. Logic accounts for almost no behavior -- conscious or unconscious; need satisfaction does account for most behavior.

2. We can "shape" values and attitudes in much the same fashion we use reinforcement to teach kids to read. (small steps, immediate knowledge of results, fairly regular successes and self-pacing).
3. Insight is of relatively little value in securing direct behavioral modification. (I have counseled too many alcoholics who have all the insight in the world and walk out of my office to the nearest bar; and I also have taught principals to listen and respond to what teachers are feeling, rather than what they are saying, and then heard them report countable reduction of instances of faculty dissension.)
4. The greatest chance for implementing stable behavioral modifications lies in helping individuals and groups toward an understanding of their own and others' needs, defenses, and styles of expressing their personalities (including typical problem-solving strategies, reactions to anxiety, and threat-provoking situations).

   Dreikurs says:

   > (1) "The dilemma of our time is that we are not prepared to live with each other as equals. There is no tradition to guide us, since traditional methods of dealing with each other are based on autocratic principles of the past. Then, every conflict was resolved by the one who won out; the subdued had to accept the solution imposed upon him. Today, solutions achieved through force are short-lived; the power and superiority of everyone is constantly challenged and, therefore, only temporary. Conflicts will always exist; it is not possible for everybody to always have the same wants. But we need a new

> machinery for solving conflicts; in a democratic setting it is necessary to reach agreement rather than to overpower each other. And we do not know how to reach agreement."
>
> (2) "On the other hand, when we are not sure of our own adequacy and worth, we cannot gain respect because we do not respect ourselves. To make it worse, we may even try to remedy our self-doubt by pushing others down. We look for those who by their own inadequacy would give us a semblance of superiority regardless of how inadequate we may feel. This process of self-elevation through humiliation is at the root of most unresolved conflicts. The real issue is contested status, barely concealed by the overt problems which often are only incidental."

I have found that in order to accomplish whatever goals I have in working with others, I must learn to listen to what they are really trying to say and tell about themselves -- their fears, their guilts, their successes, and their failures -- rather than always to my own needs (although I recognize that I am experiencing these also).

I have found that I must learn to support and encourage, rather than discourage and punish others.

I have found that I must develop sensitivity to my own and others' methods of securing attention and power -- retaliation for real or imagined slights and display of real or imagined inadequacy and inferiority.

It is the examination of one's own school experiences and, in particular, the relations one had with teachers and parents that can uncover much of administrative or teaching life-style.

If I can help myself and others to healthy use of psychological processes (which will go on regardless), perhaps communication status and ego barriers which cause us to be preoccupied and reject most in-service training attempts can be overcome, and lasting measurable changes will occur.

We do not propose psychotherapy or analysis for the entire educational fraternity (though it might not be a bad idea). What we do propose is utilization of available techniques and principles that, basically, involve working with people as people rather than as the receivers of content. We ask for recognition of the premise that directly studying, and attempting to institute changes in, interpersonal relationships offers great promise as a tool in in-service training, specifically, and in educational practice, generally.

I do not believe that these methods require tremendous sophistication or skill. I believe that warm, accepting individuals who truly believe that the untapped potential for growth exists in people and groups can utilize them.

Finally, I believe that basic respect for other people and developing relative freedom from personal threat opens the door to working with people in a truly creative "change oriented" fashion. None of us are as good as we think we are or as we can be, and -- as the saying goes -- "probably never was."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bennis, Warren G., Schein, Edgar H., Berlew, David, and Steele, Fred I., Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays and Readings on Human Interaction. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964.

2. Dreikurs, Rudolf, M.D., Psychology in the Classroom. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

3. Dreikurs, Rudolf, M.D., "The Impact of Equality," Humanist, 24, 5, 143-148, 1964.

4. Griffiths, Daniel E. (Ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

5. Hollister, William G., "Preparing the Minds of the Future Curriculum Development to Foster Ego Processes," keynote address to the National Convention of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, San Francisco, March, 1966.

6. Kemp, C. Gratton, Perspectives on the Group Process. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

7. Zalesnik, Abraham and Moment, David, The Dynamics of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

8. Zalesnik, Abraham and Moment, David, Casebook on Interpersonal Behavior in Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

CHAPTER IX

AN ADMINISTRATOR'S REACTIONS TO PRESENTATIONS

George Young

I could shorten this very much simply by saying "My reaction is favorable, I think it's fine," but I am not going to be quite that brief. I have been highly stimulated by this conference. I have done some thinking but I have refrained from making too many comments or asking very many questions, knowing that I would be able to stand here at this point before you and say some of those things. I have attempted to ask myself why it is that I'm favorable to what has gone on; why I am stimulated by it. I am stimulated by once again finding myself in an environment which I like very much. A scholarly environment, where enquiry is certainly the order of the day, and where such questions as, "Do you really know what you're doing?" are pertinent and relevant; where value questions are pertinent and relevant.

We have held a highly stimulating intellectual seminar which I've enjoyed very much. Yesterday, for example, when Pat Lynch made his presentation he was questioned several times. I think this was the only time that this has happened during the conference thus far.

The person who stimulated me to ask a question from the floor was Dr. Utter who spoke this morning about operations research. I asked my question really because I feel the behavioral approach is extremely important, and I felt this had been deprecated somewhat in favor of a cold, analytical, objective view of things, where decisions are made on the basis of what is right objectively, and then full speed ahead. Those of us who deal more in theory than in practice need opportunities to apply theory to real problems and must not shy away from this. The question of what will happen to this child, this teacher, this school principal or this parent as a result of the application of a certain theory becomes relevant.

My stimulation as a result of what has been going on, leads me to then raise a question. Would it not also be of value to us, perhaps at another session or meeting, to have practicing school administrators bring real life situations to a group? I was impressed again yesterday, in fact, by the way we have brought here representatives from other fields. This has been very helpful, at least to me. I remember our TEPS conference in Albuquerque last January when a visitor from Washington was on the panel, evaluating the various papers that had been presented. I had presented one and he happened not to mention my name, but he mentioned my paper and he was a bit negative about it because I had borrowed from the medical profession. Actually, I did not borrow from the medical profession. I started out from a particular point and began to move from that point, and low and behold as I moved in my own thinking, I came up with a model which happened to fit problems that the medical people are working on.

I was impressed yesterday that you had invited someone from the medical profession. I felt somewhat justified in having taken the approach I had taken before. There was something that came out here yesterday from the medical profession, that we have also heard from industry. They have been able to systematize what they're doing. We have not been able to systematize. For example, we have not been able to systematize teaching. We still find it difficult to tell someone how to be a good teacher. A teacher finds it difficult to explain to another teacher why it is that he succeeds in teaching someone. I find this difficult, as a matter of fact. If something happens to work for me, I have trouble attempting to explain to someone else what I did that resulted in some good result.

We have not been able to systematize the things we do. Robert Anderson from Harvard made this comment and in so doing irritated a very large group of teachers. We had 500 teachers at the Illinois conference to which I had invited him, and he irritated them very much by saying this. "Teaching is an art." "Boy," everyone said, "you're darned right it is, and I'm an artist too and I know how to do these things!" "Teaching is an art," he said, " and that's a shame. It's high time it was changed." He said medicine was an art some years ago. Thank God, it no longer is. The doctors can now diagnose, they can test, they can evaluate and they can come up with procedures to be used as a result of their diagnosis. Robert Anderson was saying this should happen in our profession.

I happen to agree with him. I think it is time we were moving in the direction of being able to systematize to the same degree as the medical profession. The doctor in Las Cruces needs some information. This is immediately available to him. He dials code numbers which have to do with certain things that he has observed in a patient. Then something responds to him and he has information which is then helpful to him. We can't do that in our work. If we do select an administrator and say this is a good administrator, we find it difficult to explain why he is a good administrator. It shouldn't be that difficult. I've drawn this from what has been said. Other people in other fields have been able to systematize; we have not yet been able to do this. At least not to the extent to which I think it should be and will be done sometime.

It often is not easy for a practicing administrator to do the things which he feels are right. In the first place he has a great deal of difficulty even in expressing what he thinks is right or good. But he does have feelings and notions. One hopes he has the ability to develop within himself some set of beliefs, some kind of criteria against which to make his decisions -- some basis from which he can move. I think I have developed such a set of beliefs for myself. I won't even tell you of them because I don't intend to force them upon you. It seems to me from many of the things that we have said, that a very important part of the education of a perspective administrator is that he receives a strong experience in philosophical foundation. It is extremely helpful if one is to deal with value judgements, if one is to be called upon to defend his decisions, to be able to explain, at least to himself and to his wife, why it was that he made these decisions.

We had some questions yesterday during some of the discussions that had to do with knowing what is right or good. It seems to me that we perhaps sell ourselves too short. We do know a great deal about what is good. The question about what is right and what is good becomes much more important or much more vital to me at the point at which I feel or know that I am already doing or implementing the things that are already known to be at least workable, if not good, or if not right. If I say to you, I am not going to try to create something, or I am not going to try to stimulate change because I don't know for sure that the change that is stimulated is a good one, or I can't see far enough ahead to know where it will lead us, I think that this is not so much as an excuse, as it is an indictment.

I believe that we do know a great deal not yet found in schools, about what is right and good. We know a great deal, for example, about education across cultures; we know a great deal about what is happening to children in schools here in New Mexico. We know a great deal about how to approach educational problems with children. These things are known but much of this is not yet in practice. In the Gallup-McKinley schools we know that a majority of our children are severely educationally retarded, and yet if you look for programs within our schools now that are geared to helping solve some of these educational problems, you won't find them there. You will find them there eventually, but not now, and yet we have known for a long time that these problems exist. We know what to do about them, we just haven't done it. I became a little impatient, therefore, whenever the question is raised about "You know, we really don't know what is good, and true, and beautiful, and maybe we ought not to do anything for fear it's the wrong thing." I think it is the wise man who knows when the time has come but there are times when the best thing to do is to change what is being done. The Hawthorne effect can be positive. It can at least provide a dynamic environment in which people can work.

I would like to make a suggestion to you, at least to those of you who are in New Mexico, to those of you who particularly are associated with colleges and universities. I would like to suggest to you that you have here in New Mexico in general, and I think more particular in McKinley County, one of the most tremendous fields for research that I have seen anywhere, so far as education of children is concerned. And something has happened there within the last year or two. We suggested yesterday three steps in bringing about change. Commenting on that, almost this entire conference thus far has dealt with bringing about change and one might assume this was a strong interest with most people. I would agree with them that changes in in-service education of administrators are needed.

We suggested three steps yesterday. Pat gave them, and of course step number one is unfreezing a situation. I would like to suggest to you that in Gallup-McKinley County, this step has been taken. It has been "unfroze." I'd like to suggest to you, too, that we are in the process of moving to the second step. Directions have been indicated and suggested. And of course the third is freezing again. This, in that school district, has not occurred. This has yet to occur. By the way, it shouldn't occur too soon. This is a continuing cycle and once you're through it, then at some appropriate time it's got to be "unfroze" again. Another step has to be taken, because we continue to learn that the situation changes, we continue to discover, and therefore we continue to move.

I would like to suggest that something has been going on in Gallup-McKinley County that bears close observation, study and evaluation. I think those of you who are at college and university levels may have an opportunity here. I think you do have an opportunity, one which could be significant relative to discovering more of the process that happens when changes begin to occur; of what happens to people. Here is the opportunity to make some evaluation. The district is there, the movement is there. The first step is taken, and it is moving toward the second.

I'd like to make a few personal comments again to those of you in New Mexico. I have been in New Mexico a very short time, just two years. In that time a great deal of progress, I believe, has occurred in our school district and state, and now I am leaving, going to Canton, Ohio. I have set in motion or, at least those around me have permitted to be set in motion, certain forces within a school district.

Certain things which are very good and positive have occured in my school district. Without my making many staff changes at all, a tremendous amount of leadership has been discovered -- leadership from within the staff itself.

I very early looked for some (no pun intended) concrete example of a commitment, and we decided to use school buildings. I sought a concrete example of commitment on the part of the board of education, the principals and the community by doing certain things. We wanted to move from what we felt to be approaches to education which did not result in as good a level of learning on the part of the children as we desired to something else which we hoped would result in better learning. Therefore, we designed school buildings which are somewhat different from the traditional and which have, in and of themselves, something to say. The people who were there and who are yet there, (essentially the same staff now as three years ago), have found in themselves, at least in my opinion and in the opinion of some others who observed, qualities of leadership which apparently had not been observed before. Something has occurred, in other words.

Perhaps in the attempt to change someone, the more important change that occurs is the one that occurs in oneself. There is an interaction here as a school administrator attempts to bring some change about, whatever the change may be. In this attempt, maybe the more valuable thing that occurs is the change that occurs within himself. He becomes more mature, he becomes wiser, he may learn what not to do as well as what to do.

This conference has been quite successful up to the present time and I think we have been all highly stimulated by it. I would like to see, however, in perhaps the next conference you have, school superintendents talking to the group and saying, "Here are problems as I have them." Perhaps more discussion as to the mechanics of change would also be in order. It may well be that the most important role that a school administrator has to play now is that of an innovator, to bring about appropriate change, whatever that may mean. He should know how to approach his board, his community, and his staff in such a way that there will be a willingness to work together, a willingness to state objectives in such a way that they can be measured, and willingness to subject oneself to this measurement, to this evaluation. There must be a willingness to observe critically what one is doing and willingness to change that, if it appears that it is not working as well as it ought. Thank you very much.

CHAPTER X

RESPONSE AND IMPLICATIONS

Samuel H. Popper[*]

We are indebted to the University of New Mexico for this timely opportunity to explore the subject of in-service education in educational administration. It is a subject which has assumed proportions of a major problem not only in departments of educational administration, but also in colleges of education at large. For the same external pressures impinge also upon teacher education and all other departments that prepare people for professional roles in public school organization.

It is, moreover, a problem with which the profession has been wrestling for some time. In 1957, for example, two Yearbooks were addressed to this very problem: The Yearbook of ASCD, *In-Service Education*, and that of AASA, *The Superintendent as Instructional Leader*. For the most part, however, the dominant focus heretofore has been on technical roles in public school organization, with scant attention having been given to administrative roles.

When I was invited to give the response to this Task Force, I wrote to inquire what precisely were UCEA expectations of a Task Force? Here is what came back:

> The basic objective of a UCEA Task Force . . .
> is to capture and communicate new or emerging
> concepts related to some aspect of preparatory

---

[*] *Editorial note*: Following the presentation of papers and discussions, Professor Popper gave the response to the Task Force at its last session.

> programs. In terms of the New Mexico Task Force ... we will be concerned with providing professors some concepts which will point to new and hopefully more promising directions in the in-service preparation of school leaders.[1]

This Task Force has, in my judgement, fulfilled UCEA expectations. It has provided a frame of reference for viewing the larger problems of in-service education as they impinge upon the sector of educational administration. Rather than offer a simplistic summary of the substantive ideas that have been treated by the Task Force, I believe it would be more useful at this juncture to suggest what implications might be drawn from these ideas for future action.

You understand, of course, that because this is a "response," what I have to suggest will reflect personal bias and intellectual convictions. These, after all, are the essential stuff of a Weltanschauung through which I attribute social meaning to the realities I perceive.

The Background Papers

The background papers from Howsam and Goldhammer brought us face-to-face with the phenomenon of change in modern society. Our world is a Heraclitean world: the same man cannot step into the same river twice, for upon the second immersion neither the man nor the river is the same. My reference to Heraclitus of ancient Greece is merely a device for focusing on the singular characteristic of modern society; the constancy of change. Science and technology has now attained a pace of sophistication which strips away the illusion of permanence from structures and processes which society deems functionally essential for what Max Weber has called "the good life."

---

[1] Letter from Jack Culbertson to author, March 21, 1966.

Structures and processes which were functionally adequate in the relatively stable social environment of yesteryear, and which has attained their zenith in the medieval world, are no longer adequate in a social environment in which change itself has become a constant. And when implementing organizational structures of society's institutional network are no longer capable of fulfilling social values, they are discarded as obsolescent; as no longer possessing, in functional terms, instrumental value. Society will at such moments turn to functional alternatives.

Who will follow Durkheim's definition of the division of labor in society and fail to recognize this inexorable principle of social organization? For the institutional network is the repository of society's most esteemed and, therefore, dominant values. Administrative organizations are expected to materialize these values through the attainment of discrete organizational goals. It is in this context that Selznick speaks of organizational goals as receptacles of social value. Thus, the "right" of any organization -- and I speak now, of course, of "legitimation" -- to draw upon the resources of society turns upon its capacity to produce outputs of social value. Its capacity to produce an output which has input value for some other subsystem of society is, from the larger view of society, the crucial measure which determines the "right" to engage in the exchange procedures which regulate the social division of labor.

Now, this basic principle of the social division of labor subsumes a host of critical corollaries. One of these is that society depends upon its formal organizations for an efficient adaptation to substantive changes in the social environment. Put another way, society depends upon formal organizations to institute those necessary changes in structure and process which will conserve the vigor of its institutionalized values in a changing milieu. And when organizations fail in this task, social disorganization, alienation, and even defection from the guiding values of society follow. Society will not for long tolerate such a state of affairs.

Implications for Professional Education

It is altogether important to have the foregoing as background for what was implied in the papers and in discussions; namely, the van position that has been assigned to education in what I view as the reconstruction of American society. Lynch, I believe, had this in mind when he said: "Increasingly, the need for reconstruction of school systems and their communities requires the best in academic talent and requires interdisciplinary research efforts."[2] Allow me to magnify this theme because it is basic to our enterprise. Indeed, it is so basic that I would assign it the status of a sine-qua-non.

Social conditions following World War II have triggered a movement of educational revitalization in the United States. The movement is dynamic, it is pervasive, and it is already transforming traditional patterns of structure and process at all levels of education. No system of education is likely to escape its confrontation: not graduate school, not college of education, and certainly not systems of public school education. For the revitalization of public school systems has been set by society in the lead position of a still larger endeavor at self-renewal through social reconstruction. [3]

---

[2] The reference will be found in the paper by Professor Patrick Lynch.

[3] The concept of a "revitalization" as it is used in this context follows the definition of Anthony F. C. Wallace: "A revitalization movement is ... a deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture." See Anthony F. C. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," American Anthropologist, Vol. 58, April, 1956, p. 264.

Only once before was American education of the national period caught up in a similar wave of revitalization. It began in higher education soon after the Civil War and it ended on the eve of World War I with a so-called reorganization of secondary education. Between these two peaks of an earlier revitalization, American educational systems were turned toward the twentieth century.

The revitalization of public school education after Appomattox was of one piece with the reconstruction of traditional American values. Organizational innovations and adaptations in the institutional network of society had facilitated a reconstruction of the American value system -- values of the Founding Fathers -- in the emerging culture of factories and cities. A built-in political capacity in the structure of American society for self-renewal had accommodated transformations in social, economic, and political patterns without revolutionary upheavals. Out of that period of social reconstruction came the comprehensive high school, the middle school, junior college, and other innovations in education.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his education message to the 89th Congress, explained why education has been made the bellwether of comtemporary social reconstruction. "We are now embarked on another venture," he said, "to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands for a new day." And, continued the President: "Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin -- with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized." And at the 1965 White House Conference on Education, he said: "Education will not cure all the problems of society, but without it no cure of any problem is possible. It is central to the purpose of this Administration and at the core of our hopes for a

Great Society." The speed with which the Congress responded to the President's education message with legislation to initiate new educational ventures expressed the social urgency for educational revitalization in political terms.[4]

Ready or not, like it or no, public school administration in the United States has been "put on the spot." The symbolic and instrumental leader of American society has defined the mission of professional education in a dynamic movement which has taken as its political slogan "The Great Society." Responsive chords are heard everywhere in American education. Said one university president at the White House Conference of 1965: "The University must be an action agency" and help solve big city school problems.[5] And a large city superintendent, echoing no doubt the sentiment of colleagues, said: "Schools and school leaders cannot remain aloof from other areas of government; they must be 'knee-deep' in the building of a greater society . . ."[6]

Educational administration has already initiated some innovative responses to the social urgency for educational revitalization. These, however, have been for the most part directed at preparation programs. Surely, there is no need to spell out for professors of a UCEA Task Force the qualitative character of these responses. We agree, however, that much remains to be done in perfecting what has been initiated in preparation programs and that even bolder innovations will have to be pursued. But, we are also of one mind that a department of educational administration now has to assume a responsibility for the continuing effectiveness of those whom it certifies to society as equipped to undertake the role of school administrator.

---

[4] This point of view will be found more fully developed in Samuel H. Popper, The American Middle School: An Organizational Analysis (Boston: The Blaisdell Publishing Co., forthcoming), especially Chapter XIV, "The Turn Ahead."

[5] Fred H. Harrington, President, University of Wisconsin, quoted in American Education, 1965, Vol. 1, July-August, 1965, p. 27.

[6] Sidney Marland, Jr., Superintendent of Schools, Pittsburgh, Ibid., p. 26.

If my assessment of the situation conforms with the thinking of this Task Force, and I believe it does, then what we are concerned with actually is the continuing education of school administrators. More than semantic accident, I believe, accounts for the recurring interchange in our discussions of the expressions continuing education and in-service education. There is a qualitative implication here of significance.

Continuing education implies that the preparation program is not longer to be regarded as terminal, but as a foundation for future professional development. Such a frame of reference at once rules out educational booster shots, the ivory-tower syndrome of professors, and, perhaps most important of all, it rules out the "cargo cult" which has evolved in the interaction between professors and practitioners in the field.[7] It means, in short,

---

7. The concept of a "cargo cult" is used by anthropologists to define a relationship between two cultural systems in which one system imports, as ship's cargo, the developed products of another system; becomes dependent upon them, and thereby retards its own cultural development. The scene in the motion picture Mondo Cane, which shows African natives (cont'd. next page)

that, as in the case of preparation programs, continuing education will have to deal with complexities rather than minister to simplicities.

Intimations of Things to Come

Cues in the social environment leave no doubt that, before much longer, schools of education will be in continuing education with seven league boots. Will departments of educational administration be ready? Some departments are already over extended in continuing education, with alarming consequences to other vital interests. Cunningham, in a perceptive commentary on this subject, has concluded: "It is suspected that one of the objectives of the

---

7. (Cont'd. from page 122) waiting for the white man's bird to descend laden with artifacts is illustrative of the "cargo cult."

Lynch in his paper made several indirect references to this concept in the discussion of university field service bureaus. He spoke, for example, of "outside expertise, sold to the client system," and of school systems that purchase "the service of outside expertise to advise it on a course of change." Then Lynch registered one dysfunctional aspect of "cargo cult:" "Interactions between the survey experts and the actors in the system were guarded and limited. There was no imperative on the part of the clients to learn techniques of the study or necessarily to learn anything more about themselves."

In still another context -- a UCEA position paper on the professorship in educational administration -- Douglas R. Pierce points up the eroding concomitants of "cargo cult" on the professorship. See "Exchange Patterns of the Educational Administration Professorship: An Analysis and a Statement of Position." A UCEA Position Paper, forthcoming.

authors of Titles III and IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was to build into law obligations on the part of personnel in universities and local school districts to cooperate in the development of in-service ventures."[8] Then Cunningham makes a sledge-hammer point: "The group ignored most conspicuously in federal programs (for in-service education) has been educational administrators, for there are virtually no provisions directly relating to administrators in current legislation."[9] How ironic! Those who must provide the institutional leadership in the revitalization of public education have been virtually ignored in omnibus legislation which means to hurry it along.

Again, cues in the social environment hint at the dreadful consequences which might follow from such a state of affairs, unless those who share in the responsibility for the administrative stewardship of public education intervene conjointly forthwith to set the matter right. Here I have in mind, of course, departments of educational administration, UCEA, and organized bodies of school administrators: AASA, NASSP, and DESP. What follows are some cases in point.

Cunningham in the earlier cited commentary on Public Law 89-10 took pains to note that the National Science Foundation was located by Congress outside of the U. S. Office of Education, which, at least by Congressional definition, is regarded as the pinacle of educational expertise in the United States.

---

[8] Luvern L. Cunningham, "Improved Possibilities for In-Service Education," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. XIV, January, 1966, assigned p. 4.

[9] Ibid., assigned p. 3.

Why? Is it possible, one might conjecture, the Congress felt NSF was too important to be entrusted to professional educators? And moving downward to schools of education, Culbertson injected the following thought in a paper which he prepared for a recent conference on Strategies for Educational Change:

> "The current gap between educational investment and educational planning suggests that the important questions during the decade ahead will relate more to the direction and manner of educational change than to its rate and scope. *Will colleges of education, for example, move in the direction of extinction or of distinction?*[10] " (Italics added)

When I came upon this passage in Culbertson's paper, it was as if I were hearing at that instant the *Götterdämmerung* theme in Wagner's music drama. The alternative of "extinction" will, no doubt, strike many of our colleagues, especially those in old-established colleges of education, as beyond the pale of reality. Let us not forget, however, that colleges of education are not a part of the universal scheme and, as was pointed out earlier, social consequences of functional obsolescence in the institutional network are harsh. There are those in society who already hold that teacher education in the United States has turned obsolescent, that teacher preparation is properly a function of liberal education, and that colleges of education are no longer needed in the enterprise of education.

---

[10] Jack Culbertson, "Organizational Strategies for Planned Change in Education," paper given at the Conference on Strategies for Educational Change, U. S. Office of Education, November, 1965.

And who in the organization of public school systems is by role definition obliged to provide the professional leadership which will determine "the direction and manner of educational change?" This question takes us straightaway to the complex sector of institutional leadership and Selznick's concept of executive statesmanship. Would you say a college of education is moving "in the direction of extinction or of distinction" should its department of educational administration fail to enter this sector with carefully structured programs of continuing education? Divorce the institutional commitments that are internalized in educational leadership and you are left with administrative technicism; with administrators who, as Goldhammer has put it in his paper, are "interchangeable among functions" and can just as well be prepared in some institutionally neutral department of administration. But if Callahan has taught us anything in his Education and the Cult of Efficiency, it is that administrative technicism detached from institutional perspective is destructive of social -- say educational -- values and, therefore, reduces educational administration to a sterile process.

Where in the scheme of modern day social reconstruction is the proper place for a department of educational administration when practitioners are confronted with the following proposals to displace them because of administrative ineptness in fulfilling emergent educational values? Under the engaging title of "The Public Schools are Failing," one writer has recently proposed in a popular magazine:

> "Private corporations could go into the education business, either on a profit or nonprofit basis. If I.B.M. can manage a Job Corps camp for the poverty program,

> it might well run a Harlem elementary school better than the present public school bureaucracy does.
>
> Groups of like-minded teachers who find themselves frustrated by the existing school system could band together and set up new kinds of schools. By giving teachers a free hand to do things that excite them, teacher-initiated schools might attract and retain a much better staff than the present system does.
>
> Parents, neighborhood antipoverty boards, and other agencies could set up their own schools in competition with or under contract to the school board."[11]

Sheer fancy, one might be tempted to conclude. But Otis A. Singletary of the Job Corps program does announce from public platforms: "What we have done, for better or for worse, is to create a third public school system."[12] One can quarrel with his estimate of the situation, but somehow what comes uncomfortably to mind is Ralph Linton's observation: "A fish doesn't know it's in water until you remove it from water." Rome did not fall in one day; a social catastrophe will often have deceptively innocent beginnings.

Of course, one has to be parsimonious in attributions of social meaning to such proposals and utterances. But the hard fact is that many administrators of public school systems are already battling for survival in their chosen careers. They need help desperately. Most of all, they need fresh insights and new orientations to old and emergent school problems. And if departments of educational administration are incapable of helping them, or unwilling, they will turn elsewhere. But then the day might come when public school administrators will paraphrase Shakespeare's King Henry and say: "Go hang yourself, brave professor of educational administration. We have fought the battle for professional school administration and you were not there." Make no mistake: Public Law 89-10 means to test the mettle of public school administration in the United States!

---

[11] Christopher Jencks, "The Public Schools Are Failing," The Saturday Evening Post, Issue No. 9, April 23, 1966, p. 18.

[12] Quoted in Minneapolis Tribune, December 18, 1965.

The Challenge of Continuing Education

A definition of the challenge which now confronts departments of educational administration is, to use an expression favored by Andrew Halpin, "indecently simple." It is essentially the same challenge which confronts them in preparation programs. Departments of educational administration are not likely to declare professional bankruptcy by default. They will, as they must, respond with innovative strategies to the call from practitioners. One of these strategies, it seems to me, will have to take the form of an organized and ongoing program for continuing education which, in the valuation scheme of a department, will have to be given an equal weighting with preparation programs. Our discussions have made it crystal clear that many procedural obstacles have to be overcome before a department can assume such a stance. For one thing, the reward system of a college -- social, psychological, and material -- would have to be redefined. For another, the credit-granting dilemma would have to be resolved. But these strike me as lesser problems. Much more vexatious is the continuing problem of getting a fix

3

on the proper place and function of theory in educational administration. It is a problem which, we will recall, also troubled one of the graduate students who participated in the discussions.

As I see it, there are two interrelated aspects to this problem. One of these is the integration of theory and practice in educational administration. I have heard it said over and over in UCEA and NCPEA discussions that if only we had a "theory of educational administration" most problems of preparation -- and one assumes also of continuing education programs -- would vanish. For my part, I do not share this view. Our problem, it seems to me, is not a lack of theory, but rather the integration of available theory with administrative technology and the invention of effective delivery systems in our preparation and continuing education programs.

We have at our finger tips a veritable cornucopia of relevant theory. We have available to us theories of the "middle range" as well as theories of sweeping grandeur: Weber, Pareto, Durkheim, and Parsons. Indeed, Parsons' general theory of social systems provides us with a four-systems model for viewing social behavior in society and in all of its subsystems, including, of course, public school organization. His "Pattern Variables," for example, is a powerful analytical tool for the study of value orientations in organization and, therefore, the sources of conflict. Principals and superintendents have to ride a paradox in effecting a transaction of universalistic and particularistic orientations in school organization; i.e., the nomothetic and idiographic, and insofar as the desideratum is survival in an administrative role, the metaview of Parsonian theory can be a source of more practical insights than all the textbooks in educational administration before, say, the era of CPEA centers or UCEA.

Educational administration is, after all, an applied social process not unlike that of, let us say, business administration or hospital administration. Each of these processes, to be sure, is applied in organizations which perform discrete functions in the social division of labor and, therefore, pursue different goals. Each of them, however, has developed from a folkway stage to higher levels of sophistication. But no one to my knowledge devised in one fell swoop the sophistication which one now sees in the administration of some of our large business organizations: no one sociologist, economist, political scientist, etc. As schools of business administration effected a successful integration of practice and theory in preparation programs, they evolved the synthesis which is now employed in sophisticated industrial management. The practice of business administration has been fused with the metaskills of theory.

But in educational administration we are still struggling with the age-old problem of speculative philosophy: rationalism vs. empiricism. And this takes me to the second aspect of the problem. Howsam and Goldhammer touched upon it in their papers and it was a topic of more than passing interest in our discussions. How useful, then, to recall in this age of probabilistic knowledge Immanual Kant's admonition that a body of facts (empiricism) without theory (rationality) is blind and theory without facts is empty?

Nevertheless, departments of educational administration continue to be divided by what C. P. Snow has popularized as "two cultures." Bound by the American pragmatic tradition, experience is exalted and the practical value of theory as metaknowledge is neglected. The ubiquity of this polarization in departments of educational administration has been pointed up most recently in the report of the Executive Director to the Plenary Session of UCEA in 1966.[13]

Educational administration, like other types of administration, is capable of being enriched with sophistication by drawing from the behavioral and social sciences. But we, by ourselves, must integrate that which is drawn with the technology of our enterprise. This is what Roald Campbell has in mind when he speaks of the need for professors of educational administration in the role of "developer."[14] And did not Superintendent George Young of Gallup, New Mexico say to us: "We need professors who are capable of converting theory so that practitioners in the field can get hold of it and apply it to problems?" Lest we forget, Harold Guetzkow defined this problem for us in precisely these terms back in 1958 at the Kent NCPEA. He conceptualizes

---

13. "Jack Culbertson," according to the minutes of the Plenary Session," . . . offered the thesis that departments of educational administration can usefully be viewed from the perspective of conflicting cultures. The values, skills, attitudes, and behaviors associated with science and the study of educational administration are central to one culture, while the values, attitudes, behaviors, and skills associated with the practice of education and administration are central to the other." See Minutes of the Plenary Session of UCEA, Traymore Hotel, Atlantic City, February 1966, p. 2.

14. Roald F. Campbell, "Training Research Professors of Educational Administration," in Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen Hencley, eds., Educational Research: New Perspectives (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963).

the problem as one of "conversion barriers."[15]

We do possess the intellectual technology which sophisticated school administration now requires and which can be of tremendous help to men on the "firing line." Social psychology, following the papers by Berger and Caplan, does provide us with insights and skills which is required to induce high levels of human efficiency in organizations.[16] There is no question whatsoever in my own mind that a school superintendent who has mastered the intellectual skill of applying Parsons' theoretical construct of a hierarchy of three primary subsystems, distinguishable within complex systems by the functional character of roles that constellate in each of them, has greater

---

15. Harold Guetzkow, "Conversion Barriers in Using the Social Sciences," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. IV, June, 1959.

16. According to Carl Rogers:

> "We know how to provide conditions in a work group, whether in industry or in education, which will be followed by increased productivity, originality, and morale . . .
>
> We know how to provide the conditions of leadership which will be followed by personality growth in the members of the group, as well as by increased productivity and improved group spirit . . ." See

Carl R. Rogers, "Implications of Recent Advances in Prediction and Control of Behavior," Teachers College Record, Vol. 57, February, 1956. Quoted in Benjamin M. Sachs, Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966), p. 8.

survival strength than one who does not.[17] These things we already have! But the problem is how can we share what we have with our colleagues on the "firing line." This problem is the heart and guts of the challenge of continuing education that now confronts departments of educational administration.

The Next Step

We, as was stated earlier, have fulfilled the first phase of the Task Force mission. We have conceptualized the problem. These proceedings will be published by our host institution and shared with colleagues in the profession; in UCEA universities and, I hope, with leadership personnel in organized bodies of school administrators. For an early consensus on action to be taken is imperative.

Moreover, the phenomenon which has absorbed us these past three days, we agree, will constrain departments of educational administration to develop a complex network of communications not alone with school systems, but also with local affiliates of AASA, NASSP, DESP, and, yes, The National School Boards Association. And by all means, one hopes the continuing education of professors of educational administration will not be overlooked. Indeed, Dean Chester Travelstead, who, I am pleased to acknowledge, sat with us throughout the Task Force period, urges the wisdom of including deans of colleges

---

17. During one of the discussion sessions, the functional utility of this construct was highlighted in references to the place of a superintendent in collective bargaining and the interaction of institutional, managerial, and technical roles in public school organization.

of education in continuing education programs. Clearly, then, the scope of the task ahead has complex ramifications. It is a task beyond the capacity of any one department of educational administration or of one institution, however affluent and prestigious. Moreover, continuing education programs will no doubt have to reflect cultural differences which mark the regions of our nation. What will work in the Southwest may not work as well in the Northeast.

Although we have not talked about procedural next steps per se, I believe it is not out of order for someone in my role on a program to suggest a "next step." Come what may of such a suggestion, it at least serves as a point of departure for crystallizing a consensus on what has to be done next. Accordingly, I would urge the following:

1. UCEA together with other organized bodies in educational administration should devise the necessary strategies for amending Public Law 89-10 so that school administration would be defined as a discrete category in the support provision for "in-service" education.

2. We recommend to the UCEA board of directors that the momentum which has been generated here be sustained through its continuing attention to the mission which has been set for this Task Force.

3. It is hoped that the UCEA staff will be directed to apply to an appropriate funding agency for a planning grant in support of the second phase of this Task Force. The second phase should bring together professors of educational administration, practitioners, and representatives of organized bodies from all levels of school administration who conjointly will plan the third phase of development and implementation.

4. It is proposed that UCEA perform the entrepreneurial and coordinating function of the third phase, which one hopes will also be funded, and that groups of departments of educational administration in different regions of the country assume the burden of developmental tasks.

If much of what I have put before you in my "response" has a familiar ring, it is because external conditions constrain us now to wrestle with the same problems that confronted us during the early period of UCEA, at the time when we were mostly concerned with preparation programs. Precisely because continuing education has to be regarded now as a supplement -- and not as a peripheral adjunct which can be ignored with impunity -- of preparation programs, problems of the two strike us in the sector of experience as two sides of the same coin. Society, I am confident, will support us in any bold actions we propose in coming to grips with this problem. But does educational administration have the "nerve" to propose bold actions of a magnitude which these times require?

"The failure of nerve" is a characterization which Gilbert Murray attributed to the Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. Up to that period, Greek ideology was anchored to a solid faith in man's rational powers. Human intelligence, so the Greeks believed, was capable of encompassing all there was to be known in man's world. But then the Hellenic world came under the heavy stresses and strains of change and the Greeks abandoned their steadfast belief in man's rational powers. It was, according to Murray, "a failure of nerve."

School administration in the U. S. can be said to have experienced a similar episode during its relatively short history. Administrative statesmanship of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the administrative statesmanship which effected the institutional adaptations that gave us the shape of school organization today, was abandoned after 1910 for what Callahan has called the "cult of efficiency." There was a "failure of nerve" in school administration when administrators and school boards turned vulnerable to the cult.

Now there has occurred a recovery of nerve. Halpin sees this as "the new movement" in educational administration. And he is right! The emergence of UCEA, CASEA, and the sixth-year resolution of AASA are of one piece with my reference to a recovery of nerve. But do we have the nerve to continue in the UCEA direction which has blocked out the first five-year plan? Do we have the nerve to extend to programs of continuing education the orientation UCEA has brought to preparation programs? I believe we have! And what is more, together with our colleagues in AASA, NASSP, and DESP we also have the talent to attain those objectives to which our will aspires.

CHAPTER XI

DR. CULBERTSON'S CLOSING REMARKS

Thank you very much, Sam. I would like to personally, and on behalf of UCEA, express appreciation to the University of New Mexico for the contributions which they have made to implement what Sam might call a temporary system here, relative to improvement of in-service education. Specifically, Chester, we are very grateful to you not only for the financial support which you have helped bring about, but perhaps just as important, the moral support which you have given us by attending the sessions here and participating in them. Paul Petty, Pat Lynch -- thank you especially for all of your work with your colleagues here to plan this. I think we also owe a debt to representatives here from the major organizations, institutions that are going to have to be involved in the solution of some of the problems we have discussed. We are particularly grateful to the educational leaders of the public schools, like the Woodwards, the Ray Collins, who have come to deliberate with us, and we know that people such as this are going to be very important in the solution of these problems.

We are grateful that Al Bisset of the U. S. Office of Education, whose organization has been referred to a number of times as an important element in this whole problem, is here representing the U. S. Office of Education and has expressed to us several times his deep interest in the problems we are discussing. And it is interesting indeed that we have representatives of the so-called third partner in the industry, Litton, here with us. I am sure that their discussion has brought out the relevance of these various groups, including also such non-profit corporations such as Sandia Corporation.

A great deal could be said at this point, I want to be very brief. I think we ought to remind ourselves again of something that was brought out here explicitly at times; namely, that we are on trial. Sam's discussion reminded me this morning about a conversation that I had ten days ago with a person in one of the large foundations in this country. We were talking about some recent developments particularly related to educational administration. One of these, for example, is the new development in California on the Irvine campus where they are projecting the graduate school of administration. Ten years from now they will have 50 professors studying and working with school districts, business, and government in the kinds of problems we have been talking about here. This is a new institution coming into being with quite a different conception -- about two-thirds of the training there for these various personnel, government, hospital, educational, and business will be common to them all. We were talking about one of the leading business schools, one of the most famous business schools in this country now, planning a Ph.D. program in Educational Administration. These are some of the things which offer us both challenge and opportunity.

Those of us who are Professors of Educational Administration have the great value of experience in this field and some of the limits of traditions. On the other hand, I think some of these developing organizations which I mentioned have the limits of inexperience but the values that come from fresh views and fresh perspectives and problems. Sam Goldman brought out a major point this morning when he said our problem was that of avocation. I would hope that we could have the major thrust, and I think we will have that major thrust on this problem in the months and years ahead. I see this taking several directions and I will just mention a few without going into detail.

I see us trying out with school districts systematically -- and I would hope that a half-dozen universities might do this -- and selecting some of the processes which have been discussed, such as Bob Berger's model, the sensitivity dream model, and the model that Stan Caplan presented. We must test out much more carefully and systematically these ways of operations research and other models, these ways that are now developing of actually supplying knowledge in school districts. I would hope also that we might create, in addition to testing out hypotheses, some new institutional arrangements between universities and school districts. Pat Lynch's ideas on this are illustrative of things that might be done. I think we must give much greater consideration than we have in the past to the training of personnel, both on the short and long term basis.

It is very clear that many new kinds of specialization are emerging now in educational administration. We see people who are advancing knowledge, people who are synthesizing knowledge, people who are interested in applying knowledge, educational administrators who do apply knowledge in school districts every day. Up to this point we haven't really much idea of where these people are going to be recruited from, or the differences in the kinds of programs they should have. I see a major objective here over the next ten years of clarifying the nature of these emergent specializations and training a lot more people than we have at the present time for these programs. I believe that we must give bold thought to the problem of content and the delivery of content in educational administration.

I agree with Sam that we have a great deal of content, or concepts if you will, which we could deliver much better than we are doing, and we need to devise special ways of doing it. I say this is one of the great challenges facing us and I think that we are not to the point where within the next two years we might be able to solve the crux of this problem. I see that in the future extremely important leadership in coordinated roles will stem from this wide-spread involvement of people from many disciplines in education and in educational administration.

This foundation official of whom I was speaking said during our conversation, referring to the famous business school where they are now developing programs of educational administration, "Twenty years from now we'll be part of your establishment." I think that is an interesting hypothesis. If they are a part of our leadership establishment 20 years from now, I believe it will come about through leadership on our part, through our helping set the direction, our helping educate the very people who are now becoming involved in various ways. I looked at the cooperative research program and got some of their figures and I found that there are four times as many social scientists carrying on research proposals now as there were five years ago. In addition, the roles that Sam mentioned of all these social scientists interested in education require leadership if there is to be a movement.

Perhaps we haven't begun to unfreeze here, to use Pat's termnology. Now the challenge is to give leadership to this movement and we can see it, I think, as a great opportunity because we have complained at times about personnel in the university. Outside schools of education have been criticizing without doing much. I think more and more they are entering into doing, so as I see it the greatest challenge is to get some leadership and overall coordination into this movement. We need a program of continuing education related to this as well as preparatory programs. Certainly these two are closely related. Finally, we will be calling on most of you for help as we project our own plans -- the papers which have been presented, the discussions held, have been very helpful to us in pushing further our thinking about how we can in the months ahead work further toward the objectives discussed in this meeting.

CHAPTER XII

DEAN TRAVELSTEAD'S CLOSING REMARKS

As I said to you at the beginning of this seminar, we are indebted to you for coming. Those of us here at the University of New Mexico most closely connected with preparation programs for administrators of schools have been greatly helped by your presence and participation. And we hope that you, too, will feel that your time has been well spent.

Even though I spoke briefly on Thursday, outlining objectives of the seminar, and even though my closing remarks here today might be viewed as those of the "host," I must admit to you that other faculty members, not I, should be viewed as the true hosts for this meeting. As I am sure you understand, Deans quite often do not know all that goes on in a college -- much less do they have a direct hand in preparing for such a meeting as this. Therefore, I want to identify and commend those faculty members who did do much work in connection with this seminar -- both in planning for it and in helping to carry it out. Paul Petty, Pat Lynch, Jim Cooper, Frank Angel, Horacio Ulibarri, Bill Wilson, and Devoy Ryan should be mentioned specifically, since they did most of the work.

Since I have already said that those of us here at the University of New Mexico have been greatly enriched by your attendance, we can rightly conclude that "in-service" education has been taking place -- in-service education of at least one college dean and of several members of a college and university faculty. Several of you have suggested during these discussions that in-service education of the college and university faculties is just as necessary as in-service education of the school administrators themselves. I would agree with such an observation and therefore conclude that our own in-service education at this seminar will help us more effectively to carry out the in-service education of the school administrators with whom we work.

The seminar, it seems to me, has provided an excellent continuing education experience for us all. If this is the case, the seminar has indeed been a success.

We are indebted also to Jack Culbertson and Terry Eidell of the UCEA staff for their efforts in planning and implementing this seminar. We could not have done it without them.

Then, too, we should thank with special emphasis those of you who prepared and delivered the papers which provoked our thinking and discussion.

We here at the University of New Mexico will continue our efforts to improve our pre-service and in-service programs for the education of school administrators. And we hope these efforts will justify UCEA's confidence in us.

Appendix

TASK FORCE PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institution
Angel, Frank	University of New Mexico
Bailey, Tom	University of New Mexico
Baker, Robert	Litton Systems, Inc.
Berger, Robert	University of New Mexico
Bisset, Alfred	Office of Education
Blackstone, Peg	University of New Mexico
Boicourt, Gerald	Wayne State University
Caplan, Stanley	Litton Systems, Inc.
Collins, Raymond	Manhasset, New York
Cooper, James	University of New Mexico
Coss, Ronald	University of New Mexico
Culbertson, Jack	UCEA
Deever, Merwin	Arizona State University
Eckel, Howard	University of Nebraska
Eidell, Terry	UCEA
Fitz, Reginald	University of New Mexico
Goldhammer, Keith	University of Oregon
Goldman, Samuel	Syracuse University
Griffith, Charles	University of New Mexico
Hansen, Tom	Carlsbad, New Mexico
Hecker, Stanley	Michigan State University
Helfert, Peter	University of New Mexico

Helling, John F.	University of Wisconsin
Hengst, Herbert	University of Oklahoma
Herman, Simon	University of New Mexico
Howsam, Robert	University of Rochester
Hoy, Wayne	Oklahoma State
Kline, Charles	Purdue University
Kloeppel, Joe	Bernalillo, New Mexico
Langston, LaMoine	State Department Education, Santa Fe
Lutz, Frank W.	New York University
Lynch, Patrick	University of New Mexico
Miller, Ross	University of New Mexico
Muncy, Bob	University of New Mexico
Nunn, Earl	Las Cruces, New Mexico
Orr, Rodney	University of New Mexico
Padilla, Blase	University of New Mexico
Payne, Ivy	University of New Mexico
Petty, Paul	University of New Mexico
Popejoy, Tom	University of New Mexico
Popper, Samuel	University of Minnesota
Richardson, Gordon	University of Iowa
Ryan, Devoy	University of New Mexico
Sarthory, Joe	University of New Mexico
Seaberg, John	University of New Mexico
Shasteen, Amos	University of New Mexico
Smith, George	Tucson, Arizona
Stapley, Maurice E.	Indiana University

Sternberg, Bob	Michigan State University
Suttle, John	University of Oregon
Travelstead, Chester	University of New Mexico
Trusty, Francis	University of Rochester
Ulibarri, Horacio	University of New Mexico
Utter, Robert	Sandia Corporation
Vogel, Albert	University of New Mexico
Wiley, Tom	University of New Mexico
Wilson, Bill	University of New Mexico
Wochner, Raymond	Arizona State University
Woodworth, Wm. O.	Flossmoor, Illinois
Young, George	Gallup, New Mexico